



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

G 1

५ (42)

G 86

GANDHIJI'S SATYAGRAHA

Gandhiji's Satyagraha OR Non-violent Resistance

BY
RICHARD B. GREGG
Author of Economics of Khaddar



S. GANESAN,
Publisher, Triplicane, Madras.
1930

To
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
Preface	ix
i. Truths and Virtues of Militarism ...	1
ii. The Psychology of Non-violent Resistance ...	8
iii. The Psychology of Non-violent Resistance (<i>contd.</i>) ...	38
iv. The Psychology of Non-violent Resistance (<i>concluded</i>) ...	64
v. Non-violent Resistance as a Method of War ...	80
vi. The Efficiency of Non-violent Resistance as a weapon of War ...	102
vii. Some Modern Examples of Non-violent Resistance ...	145
viii. Doubts and Queries ...	169
ix. Economic Aspects of Non-violent Resistance ...	216
x. Political Aspects and Implications ...	253
xi. Political Aspects and Implications (<i>contd.</i>)	270
xii. Philosophical and Spiritual Implications...	293
xiii. Philosophical and Spiritual Implications (<i>contd.</i>) ...	330
xiv. Non-violence in Individual Relationships.	364
xv. Hygienic and Ecological Aspects ...	388
xvi. Some Authorities for Violence ...	410
xvii. Some Apparently Ambiguous Authorities	440
xviii. The Development and Organization of Peace ...	467

PREFACE

A considerable number of people in the Western world believe that war and violence are, at best, regrettable; yet very few would concede that any non-violent method of settlement of conflicts would be either practical or desirable. But the marriage of science and war has put civilization into such a perilous position that there is now much troubled thinking on the subject.

For some years, travellers and press dispatches from India have been telling us about a man there named Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi who actually believes in an astounding idea called "non-violent resistance," and who seems to have secured a very considerable following there for his apparently preposterous doctrine, and actually to have been able to cause no small inconvenience thereby to the British Government.

Mr. Gandhi's ideas and accomplishments were so interesting that they drew

me to India where I stayed nearly four years. This book is one of the results.

Mr. Gandhi's ideas seem so preposterous to Westerners, in part, because of the difference between West and East in respect to fundamental assumptions, in social background and experience, in method of approach, in terminology, in points which are implicit but never definitely stated, in figures of speech and historical allusions. This book is an attempt to bridge these differences; to state in Western concepts and terminology the principles and practice of non-violent resistance.

I have, however, not limited the explanation merely to Mr. Gandhi's own concepts or to India, but have tried to explain and evaluate the principle in its application in any country, at any time, and under any circumstances. Mr. Gandhi's name is used in the title because to him belongs the chief credit for the most widespread and effective use of the principle, perhaps in the whole history of the world. Also because the stimulus to all my thinking on the subject came from him. He is not in any way responsible, however, for my statements.

It seems to me that in the West it is

time that the subject of pacifism, in both individual and collective use, should be removed from the profitless atmosphere, on the one hand, of warm adjectives, and on the other, of vague mysticism, futile protests, or confused or incomplete thinking. We need to understand this thing much more clearly and fully. We ought to know definitely whether or not it is intellectually respectable, and if so, to what degree or in what way.

I have, therefore, tried to test the idea with the recent findings of psychology, physiology, biology, military strategy, economics, political theory, penology, and education. Yet I have tried to be simple, to avoid technical jargon, and to keep the treatment fresh. I have tried to meet all the critics of the idea fairly on their own ground. Because the subject is controversial, and in order to aid any who may doubt or disagree with my conclusions, I have cited my sources and authorities in footnotes.

The complexity and wide ramifications of the topic compelled somewhat lengthy treatment. It is time we stopped being sketchy on a matter which really touches us all so closely. For in reality this matter is of close interest to everyone who has ever been angry or afraid, resent-

ful, revengeful or bitter, who has ever taken part in a fight, mob-violence, a skirmish, battle or war, or who has been the object of anger, hatred, exploitation, oppression, persecution or violence of any kind; also to any observers or students of such situations or their results.

I want to express my gratitude especially to Mr. Gandhi, but also to all the other Indian friends, too numerous to name here, who so illuminatingly discussed these matters with me. There are also countless unknown, humble, poor, illiterate, Indian villagers whose attitude and action, all unknown to them, influenced me deeply. To all the profound, clear and sensitive minds with which I have come in contact, in India and in other countries, in the past and the present, I owe a great obligation.

To my wife, I am grateful for help and criticism on all the manuscript, and to C. F. Andrews, Lucien Price and Francis G. Goodale for criticism of certain chapters.

RICHARD B. GREGG.

BOSTON, MASS., U. S. A., }
December, 1929. }

I
TRUTHS AND VIRTUES OF
MILITARISM

WAR is one of the oldest institutions in the history of mankind, and the habit of violent strife between individuals is still older. This fact is proof that violent conflict contains great elements of fundamental truth. Things that are wholly false cannot reach such a venerable age.

Those who care to think seriously about conflict and peace must, therefore, try to understand these truths, and give the advocates of war and violence full credit and honor for their wisdom and fidelity to their vision.

The romance of war is an undoubted fact, especially for those who have never taken part in modern war. There is in all hearts a desire to live a significant life, to serve a great idea and sacrifice oneself for a noble cause, to feel the thrill

of spiritual unity with one's fellows and to act in accordance therewith. We all wish for strenuous action and the exercise of courage and fortitude, to be carried away by the enthusiasm of daring. We all love to undergo a common discipline and hardship for the sake of a fine ideal; to be in good effective order; to be strong, generous and self-reliant; to be physically fit—with body, mind and soul harmoniously working together for a great purpose—thus becoming a channel of immense energies. Under such conditions the whole personality would be alert, conscious, unified, and living profoundly, richly and exaltedly. Then one could be truly and gloriously happy. Martial music suggests many of these elements and their consequent exhilaration and exaltation.

Probably war and conflict seem to promise such conditions partly because our ordinary life of alleged peace is so often dull, trivial, monotonous, devoid of fine purpose, selfish, hypocritical, anxious, cowardly, ill-tempered and grumbling. It is so full of frustration, balked disposition, hidden violence, oppression and meanness; so insipid, empty, fragmentary, full of cross-purposes and evil.

Such a hopeless snarl! Anything to be relieved of such a mess! So cries the

heart. Yet what a risk, to wrench ourselves from established life!

Perhaps one reason why we take such deep delight in risk and chance is because such activities are adventures in turning probabilities into possibilities and accomplished facts. Thus they are modes of creation, of "free activity of the soul," as Clausewitz says. Hence, after men have long been chained to an industrial routine, feeling themselves helpless cogs in a vast machine, the call of an immeasurable risk cannot easily be resisted.

But violence and war are attractive not merely for their romance, promises and contrasts with peace. They also have solid elements of truth and virtue.

Perhaps the most outstanding virtue and truth of violence is that of courage and its importance in life. But we must remember that violence is not the only occasion or test or proof of courage.

Another is the importance of energy. All the deep emotions, especially fear and anger, are generators of tremendous energy. To be a channel of immense energy gives one a thrill and a satisfaction that can never be forgotten. Fear, anger and hatred are doubtless evil, but the

energy that they arouse is, by itself, good ; for as William Blake said, 'energy is divine.'

Furthermore, the sincerity of fighters and warriors is admirable. They live and work, sacrifice and die for their vision of the truth, even though they may be too inarticulate to express it in words. The militarist's vision of truth may be partial and cloudy, but nevertheless he lives, suffers and dies for the truth as he sees it. He may even be inspired by hatred, anger, bitterness and revenge, and may put his whole faith in material weapons; but he is true to himself and the faith that is in him. That much is fine and solid.

There is still another virtue of the militarists which deserves our admiration. The Irish poet, George Russel (AE), described it thus :—¹

...“We must admit that military genius has discovered and applied with mastery a law of life which is of the utmost importance to civilization—far more important to civil even than to military development—and that is the means by which the individual will forget his personal danger and sacrifice life itself for the general welfare. In no other organization will men in great masses so entirely forget themselves as men will in battle under mili-

1. *The National Being* pp. 127, Macmillan, 1916.

tary discipline.....The military discipline works miracles."

One more militaristic truth is that conflict is an inevitable part of life and growth. This world is inherently diverse and changing, and conflict arises as an unavoidable and necessary element in it. No strong or sensible person would want to abolish those things which issue in conflict.

These, then, seem to be important virtues and truths of the fighter—the human need for adventure, for devotion, and a sense of unity with one's own kind; courage; fortitude; energy and strenuous action; sincerity; the value of order, training and discipline; and the inevitability of conflict in this world.

But no one can claim that war is all good. Millions of people who experienced the Great War testify to its stupidities, horrors, excess of destruction over construction, its frustrations and futilities. They predict the ultimate suicide of civilization and perhaps even of the human species, through the new powers created by science and used for war. Even Napoleon said, "I love this business of war; and I hate it."

But what can be done? Violence in

act and spirit prevails and is in power everywhere, not only in our national life but in many private relationships. We are appalled by its course, but dare not forego it, nor do we even see how to do so.

Mankind must have romance, heroism and ideals. They are historically a part of war. Violence and war are deep-set habits; and how can we change our habits suddenly? Indeed, we are loath to wrench away if that also means losing the virtues and truths associated with violence.

Is there no possible way by which we can keep the virtues and truths of violence and war, and yet avoid the evils and errors?

Intimations of such a possibility have occasionally come to us, as vague and seemingly preposterous as the news of the invention of the first actual aeroplane. But as the news has been couched in unfamiliar terms, only a few seemed to understand it and even then not very clearly. But it really can be understood, tested and put into practice by anyone who is really interested.

Because it is new, an adequate name for it is hard to find. In English the only name that has been devised which any-

where near connotes the meaning of the real thing without having too many misleading implications is the phrase, "non-violent resistance." Even that is unsatisfactory, as the discussion will show; but it will serve until some more happy term is invented.

It is the purpose of this book to explain in familiar modern terminology this new method of resolving conflicts. And inasmuch as violence is so deep-set in human nature, we will begin our discussion with the psychology of the matter.

II

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

ANY clear understanding of conflict requires a careful examination and understanding of the dynamic aspects of the psychology of fear and anger, and of the courses of action known as violence and non-violent resistance.

Most of the books on general psychology contain definitions of fear and anger, but the two most illuminating descriptions I have found are in A. F. Shand's *The Foundations of Character*¹ and in E. J. Kempf's *The Autonomic Functions and the Personality*.²

The essence of their ideas on these subjects, for our purposes, may be stated as follows :

Fear and anger are very closely

1. Macmillan Co., London, 1914, at pp. 214, 216-17, 250, and Chap. 3, Sec. 1.

2. Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Co., New York and Washington, D.C., 1921, pp. 79, 80, 82.

allied. They both have the same origin or purpose, to separate a person or animal from an object or person or force or situation considered by it to be painful, threatening or dangerous to its comfort, well-being, the easy action of its instincts, or its very existence. If the person or animal feels that it is stronger than the threatening object or situation, the emotion is anger; while if it estimates the danger as stronger than itself (including its skill), the emotion is fear.¹

"In anger the removal may be effected by driving it (the threatening object) from the environment, destroying its consistency, or, if it is a threatening posture in another animal the removal may consist of merely changing the aggressive posture of the opponent into a submissive one." (Kempf.)

The desire is either to remove the danger or to get away from it. The form of the emotion depends on the apparent relative strength of the opponents.

Hate may be described as a sort of deferred or thwarted anger. The hated person or force is too strong to be

1. Cf. in accord the "dominance-compliance" concept in *Emotions of Normal People*, by Wm. M. Marston, International Library of Psychology, Philosophy and Scientific Method, Kegan Paul, London; and Harcourt, Brace New York, 1928.

removed or destroyed, and yet not strong enough to cause flight or abject submission. Therefore, the person puts up with it, wishing all the time to destroy or harm it but not quite daring to do so, waiting for an opportunity to weaken or destroy it, but restraining his anger from blazing forth into open combat.

It seems from this that fear is always a *fear of losing* something considered valuable, such as comfort, health, easy functioning of the instincts, safety, bodily wholeness, economic security, social position, honour, an opportunity for pleasure or advancement, a treasured object or loved person, life itself, the welfare or interests of one's family, friends, community, race, or nation, etc. Always a loss or separation of some sort is threatened. So a sense of impending or possible loss is always the basis of both fear and anger. If that threat is wholly removed, the fear and anger also disappear.¹

1. Cf. also G. W. Crile—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*—W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1915. This common basis or origin of fear and anger may be one reason why it is impossible to make a valid distinction between aggressive and defensive war nowadays. Cf. W. L. Crane—*The Passing of War*—Macmillan, London, 1912; C. C. Morrison—*The Outlawry of War*—Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago, 1927.

With this clearly in mind, let us now proceed to analyze the psychology of a simple attack with physical violence by one man on another, but without the use of guns or other long distance weapons. This does not pretend to be an exhaustive analysis of every element of the situation; nor is it, I hope, a biased or unfair selection of only such items as might prove a case, with complete disregard of such elements as would disprove the argument. It is a selection and arrangement of psychological factors, many of which have been hitherto overlooked or whose relationships have been insufficiently considered, so as to put the whole discussion on a new and perhaps more useful basis. It is hoped that there will be searching criticism. It may seem at first that the discussion is over-simplified. But the complexities and difficult cases will be considered later in due course. This order is merely for clarity of discussion.

If A attacks B with physical violence and B re-acts also in like manner, the attacker, A, because of the manner of B's response, immediately feels that his anger and ill-will toward B were fully justified. B, by his ill-tempered violence, has proved that he is an evil fellow and should be

punished and rendered less able to harm others as well as A. It has given A a certain reassurance and support by showing at least that B's scale of moral values in regard to violence as a mode of settling questions is the same as A's. A mere display of either fear or anger by B is sufficient to have this effect. A feels sure of his *savoir faire*, of his choice of methods, of his knowledge of human nature and hence of his opponent. He can rely on B's acting in a definite way. A's conscience is now at rest, his morale is sustained, his sense of values is vindicated. His confidence in his general mode or method of dealing with B is reassured. He continues his attack with whole-hearted energy. All doubts as to the validity of his own cause, if he had any before the attack began, are now at an end. His indignation seems to him wholly righteous and worthy of public support. B's violent opposition has been a great moral support and vindication for the attacker, A. This holds true to the very end of the combat, whether A proves to be victor or vanquished.

Generally also, if A has been reasonably foresighted and has prepared the minds of chance onlookers or the general public, they give him their approval and

moral support. B's violence indicates to them that he at least is reasonably able to take care of himself and therefore that A's attack was not unfair. They may even suspect that B had done something before, while they were not looking, which was injurious to A, and therefore that A's attack was not really unprovoked. Or, if B's violence is particularly hearty, the outsiders may well feel that his malevolence is quite reprehensible. In any event, the circumstances prior to the attack were all so uncertain or unknown, and the possibility of hidden motives and events is so much a part of common experience, that the onlookers cannot feel sure which party was originally in the right or whether both were not partly in the wrong. Therefore, in the absence of policemen, the onlookers do nothing to interfere with either A's or B's sense of righteousness and inner conviction of moral worth and perspicacity. In general, the crowd approves both A and B, or each of them gets encouragement from some of the onlookers, at least. This usually continues, no matter what the upshot of the affray is, whether A is victor or vanquished. Both parties feel that they have at least proved their courage and manhood to the world. Even the defeated one's honor seems

to him for this reason, not wholly sullied.

So much for the emotions and assurances of the combat. What of the after-effects?

The original attacker, A, now a victor, we will suppose, wins public applause for his courage, skill and strength in fighting, and perhaps also support for his original contention, whatever it may have been. He feels that he has frightened and over-awed B, and has proved his superiority over B and compelled B to acknowledge it. A has acquired prestige and glory. Perhaps some of the onlookers flatter him by indicating a wish to associate with him. They want to gain some of his glory by reflection. His pride, vanity and self-satisfaction are increased. His original contentions and assumptions are now wholly proved and validated in his mind. He feels morally superior. He feels more secure than formerly. He has made his will effective and gained his own way. He has "settled" a question. His friends tend to feel as he feels, and support him.

The victim B, however, has been humiliated. He has had to admit A's superiority for the moment, but he vows

vengeance. His resentment seeks satisfaction as soon as possible. His original anger, repressed by circumstances, becomes hatred and longs for revenge and retaliation. He nurses his grudge. Perhaps, in some cases, forgiveness or a chance realization of the situation intervenes and all-around satisfaction and settlement is obtained. As often as not, however, this does not happen. Or if not, he may "take out" his anger on some innocent third party. His family or friends sympathize and may make his case their own. Perhaps a feud or vendetta develops. There have been many instances of feuds lasting many generations. International enmities in Europe have lasted for centuries. Retaliation provokes counter-retaliation. The original evil or damage is vastly multiplied, and absorbs an enormous amount of time and energy away from useful occupations. Often no solution is ever found which satisfies either both of the original parties or their sympathizers and abettors. These sets of emotions and results come about, no matter which party is victor.

This wider and slower-acting effect of revenge and retaliation and resentment is usually overlooked or minimized by the militarists and glorifiers of war

and physical force. It holds true whether the struggle is between two individuals, between one person and a group, or between two or more groups—whether the groups be small or large. It holds true in varying degree whether the original combat ended with no permanent injury to either side, with some injury, or with death. It runs through all forms—the spanking of a child, a fight, a criminal arrest and imprisonment, capital punishment, a lynching, a strike or riot, piracy, a military raid or “punitive expedition,” a civil or international war. Rarely is a peace settlement a true case of full satisfaction, forgiveness and solution of the entire original conflict, so that both parties feel thoroughly happy and ready to go ahead without suspicion or resentment.

But now let us suppose that A gets angry against and attacks with physical violence a different sort of person, C. The attitude of C is fearless, calm, steady, unusually good-humored and kindly, and because of a different belief, training or experience, he has much self-control. He does not respond to A's violence with counter-violence. Instead, he accepts the blows with smiling cheerfulness, but also with good-tempered reasoning,

stating his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute, his belief that A's idea is mistaken, asking for an examination of both sides of the opposed interests, and stating his readiness to abide by the truth. He opposes resistance to A, but only in moral terms. He states his readiness to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by imposing suffering on A, through violence. He accepts blow after blow, showing no signs of fear or shrinking or resentment, keeping steadily good humored and kindly in look of eye, tone of voice, and posture of body and arms. To A's violence he opposes non-violent resistance. If A wants to take something away from C, C lets him have it with every expression of kindness.

At this point the reader may say that such a person as C is wholly ideal, or at least not found once in a century, and that therefore a discussion based upon such an assumption would be wholly unreal and futile. But as a matter of fact thousands of such persons were discovered in all countries during the Great War, and thousands more developed in South Africa before the war and in India after the war.

It is true that non-violent resistance

requires a strong control and discipline of the elemental instinct of pugnacity and the elemental emotion of anger. But on the other hand, war requires an equally strong control and discipline of the equally elemental instinct of flight and emotion of fear. We may say that courage is also instinctive and aids in the discipline of war, thus making it feasible. But courage seems to grow out of either a perception of superior strength, skill, endurance or security, or the superiority of the instinct for race preservation over that of individual self-preservation, as where a mother sacrifices herself for her offspring.

But perhaps it is conceivable that in the case of non-violent resistance there is another sort of courage, growing out of a different type of strength, skill endurance or security; or perhaps here, too, there may be a factor operating for the preservation of the race—a more far-seeing factor, as it were.* Let the reader kindly suspend judgment, at least until we examine the evidence.

Of course, the race has had more experience with discipline of war than with the discipline of non-violent resistance; but that does not affect the question of the intrinsic difficulty of creating and

maintaining the latter discipline, once the matter is fully understood. Of course, the new discipline would probably be, so to say, quantitatively more difficult, because it involves control of both fear and anger; but not qualitatively or intrinsically more difficult, because both these emotions are similar in origin and in ultimate purpose, namely, race-preservation through individual self-preservation. And it seems that now the human race has perhaps developed enough knowledge and intelligence for a larger number of its leaders to begin to grasp the possibilities of this novel discipline.

The possibility of altering the expression of pugnacity and creating this new discipline will be readily appreciated by students of psychology by reference to Pavlov's researches on "conditioned reflexes."¹ Without attempting here to explain conditioned reflexes, it may be stated that Pavlov has, again and again at will, been able to alter a dog's response to a destructive or painful stimulus from one of anger or defense to one of assimilation. Or to put it in other terms, he caused the reflex of flowing of digestive juices to stop appearing in the presence

1. I. P. Pavlov—*Lectures on Conditioned Reflexes*—International Publishers, New York, 1928.

of food, and instead to appear upon feeling pain from an electric shock or a burn of an acid on the skin. The reflex was reconditioned to a new stimulus which was just the opposite sort from what would be expected.

Since Pavlov talks of "the reflex of purpose" and "the reflex of freedom," we may feel free to consider war or ordinary combat as a conditioned reflex. J. B. Watson's experiments¹ proving that a new-born baby has only two fears, that of falling and of a sudden loud noise, suggests that all other and more complex fears are conditioned reflexes. This would tend to support the idea of war as a conditioned reflex. If it is such, it may be altered and reconditioned, just as much as any other. Or if friendly behaviour or kindness can be considered a conditioned reflex, we may recondition it to respond to hostile treatment.

Such considerations as these may help us to realize that the discipline of non-violent resistance is wholly feasible and practical, once we come to understand it and see its usefulness.

1. J. B. Watson—*The Heart or the Intellect*—Harpers Monthly Magazine, Feb. 1926.

Also, J. B. Watson—*Behaviourism*, People's Institute Publishing Co., New York, 1925.

The question as to how non-violent resistant characters occur or may be developed, or the difficulties or probabilities of developing such abilities in ordinary people will be discussed at various places in subsequent chapters. Let us therefore first try to see how non-violent resistance would work, and later consider how such persons might be developed. Our willingness to try to develop such self-control or discipline might depend somewhat on whether we believe it would be effective.

What would be the effect of C's non-violent tactics upon the attacker, A?

The first feeling of A will be surprise, because such a reaction as C's to violent attack is so unusual and unexpected. A's first thought may be that C is afraid of him; that C is a coward, ready to give way and acknowledge defeat. But C's look and posture show not fear, but courage. His steady resistance of will as shown by his words and posture shows no subservience. His steadiness under pain is startling.¹ A is constrained to pause in wonder. If he was inclined at first to

1. "All observers agree that it is easier and requires less courage to attack than to withstand fire without retaliation." F. C. Bartlett—*Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927, at p. 175.

be scornful or contemptuous of C, those feelings soon become displaced by curiosity and wonder. Shand says (p. 448 of his book before cited), "Wonder tends to exclude Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt in relation to its object."

A becomes dimly or subconsciously aware that C's scale of values is strangely different from his own and from most people's. C's fortitude under punishment and his steady goodwill makes A suddenly admire C's courage and uncertain of his own valuations and methods. He vaguely realizes that C has taken and maintained the moral initiative. C's persistent kindness and offers of a settlement in terms of truth and fairness tend to make A realize that perhaps he was not going to lose anything after all; that all his fierce exertion was unnecessary, wasteful and a little foolish. If he has taken an object away from C, he now realizes that C would have given or shared it with him, and that C is not miserly or exclusive at all. If there are onlookers, A perhaps begins to feel a little undignified in their eyes—even ineffective and ludicrous, perhaps. By contrast with C's conduct he begins to feel himself less generous and a little brutal or unfair. He somewhat loses his

THE PSYCHOLOGY

inner self-respect—has a slight sense of inferiority. He, of course, doesn't want to acknowledge it but his feelings betray themselves in his hesitance or decreasing firmness of manner, speech or glance. The onlookers perceive it; and he himself senses a loss of public support. C's fortitude and self-control make A realize that he (A) has failed to demonstrate any superior skill, strength, endurance or self-control. That hurts his pride, his anger flares up and he strikes or wounds C again. But C's response continues kindly; and he continues to offer other means of dignified settlement of the matter. C realizes that any show of contempt on his part would only arouse A's rage still further. But C does not even feel contempt, for he has such interest and goodwill toward A's potential good nature and abilities.

A dimly realizes that C's courage is higher than mere physical bravery or recklessness that it is somehow a clearer and stronger realization or understanding than his own of human nature or perhaps of some ultimate powers or realities in the background of life. He realizes perhaps that C's attitude toward property is finer and more generous than that of most people. This dumbfounds and

GANDHIJI'S SATYAGRAHA

troubles A and fills him with self-distrust..

Yet C continues in an attitude of respect toward A, and appeals to A's better nature and finer instincts. Strangely, he seems even to trust A. This trust, like financial credit, is stimulating and creative. A's fear of humiliation goes, and thereby his anger fades. He sees that his original fear of loss which lay behind his anger prior to his attack on C, has no grounds. He realizes he made a mistake, but cannot rouse more resentment or ill-feeling toward C because of the latter's unmistakable attitude that it was all merely a very natural mistake; that he bears no ill-will toward A and wants only to find a fair and honorable way out of the difficulty. C's sincerity is patent and incontrovertible, for he has maintained his decent and kindly manner under the severest provocation. Plainly C is a man to be trusted. He shows great consideration for A's interests and personality. He reiterates his desire to settle matters only in accordance with the complete truth. Apparently C is not self-seeking. He does not shout for help or threaten to tell the police. A feels that even after he relaxes his belligerent actions and attitude he need not fear that

C will bear malice or resentment or revengeful feelings toward him. A has no more grounds for suspicion of C.

If at the start A had any romantic notions that he was going to show great daring and heroism, that he was going to be a defender of others or going to risk his life or safety in a glorious adventure, all that glamour fades away. His morale crumples. He realizes that he has lost prestige. Probably he will talk angrily and boastfully for some time, and go through many subterfuges to "save his face" and to regain, if possible, his lost dignity, prestige and self-respect or self-esteem. But C is so consistently decent that A cannot again attack him or even continue long to vent angry words upon him. Sooner or later, the steam blows off. Perhaps poor A's anger even turns on himself; and he may go so far as to feel shame and remorse. His desire for action seeks an outlet in pity for C's injuries or wounds, and he (A) seeks to repair the damage forthwith and thus regain some part of his self-respect.

All this ebb and flow of feeling and action by A may take place in different order from what is above described. Its temper, intensity, tone or flavour, so to speak, would vary according

GANDHIJI'S SATYAGRAHA

to the circumstances and character of the persons involved. It might take a considerable time to work through. As between sensitive persons, the course of feelings and actions might be almost instantaneous. With a very proud or self-deceiving person, or a hardened soldier or policeman as attacker, the actual violence might be severe and repeated and lasting before the change of attitude or heart of the attacker would come about. Yet even among such attackers the surprise and wonder would be so great as often to cause a far quicker face-about than might be expected.

But what is the psychology of the affair if A is filled with the sort of cruelty or greed, pride, insolence, bigotry, lust or hardness that seems to grow on what it feeds on?

Shand shows most interestingly¹ how cruelty is a complex of fear, anger and pride.

“When fear restrains the impulse of anger, in a mind capable of reflexion and foresight, it tends to render anger deliberately cruel. . . .

“What is meant by cruelty implies enjoyment in inflicting pain, and the intention or desire to inflict it. . . . For this anger that is successful in

1. Loc. cit. at pp. 268 and 269.

attaining its end has the enjoyment of success, and, when this success coincides with the subjection of another, the enjoyment of pride.

... "When fear restrains the impulse of anger, it tends to render anger at first more painful, and afterwards revengeful and cruel: as if there were a desire of inflicting suffering in revenge for the pains of fear. . . . But when the initial and painful stage of anger is prolonged, when it is restrained by the most painful of all emotions, fear, so humiliating to pride, we can understand how the coward who dares not attack his enemy openly, or without superior advantages, broods over his revenge, and how his revenge becomes deliberate, implacable, and cruel. And thus it is that cowardly men are so often cruel, because the same circumstances that tend to arouse their anger tend also to arouse fear, so that there arises a constant interaction between these emotions."

Greed and lust are really desires for security and completion, though badly mistaken as to method, means and material. In a sense they are a fear of lack. Pride is another mistaken sense of divisiveness, as will be further considered in a subsequent chapter. Bigotry is an obstinate narrow religious pride.

The prouder a person is, the less willing he is to admit that anyone else, especially one to whom he feels superior, can teach him anything. Therefore, the only way you can teach such a person is

by example. The only way he will learn is by unconscious imitation. The minute he becomes aware of his change of conduct he tries to cover up the imitation by all sorts of excuses, pretences, explanations and rationalizations.

In all such instances the tendency of non-violent resistance is to remove fear, anger, any foreboding or dread of loss or sense of separateness, and to give instead a feeling of security, unity, sympathy and goodwill. In the light of the above analysis, we see that this operates to remove cruelty, pride, lust and hardness.

All support is removed from the attacker for any divisive emotions or sentiments in relation to the victim, fear, anger, hatred, indignation, pride, vanity, scorn, contempt, disdain, disgust, anxiety, worry, apprehension. It is not that such feelings are balked or suppressed; they merely no longer have a cause or basis.

In some difficult cases, non-violent resistance can operate but slowly; but its pressure is nevertheless sure and inevitable. You may exclaim impatiently, "But while it is taking so long to act, the victim gets killed or starved!" I must

ask you to consider that event with me in a subsequent chapter. Let us try here merely to see whether and how a certain set of forces will act, if time and space exists for them. If the psychological principle is correct, we will discuss the physical circumstances in due order.

It may be said further on this point that probably in most cases of apparent failure of non-violent tactics, the victim showed either fear or anger or lack of discipline. When a whole group or community was involved, there may also have been defective leadership, a failure to understand or fully trust to non-violence. There must be present *moral* resistance—an active, bold and confident courage, protest, reasoning and indication of other means of settlement.

Remember that at this point we are discussing only an encounter between two people. Attacks by police or soldiers under military orders will be considered in the following chapters. Killing will be discussed later also. If the reader is inclined to doubt whether this description is a true statement of the actual psychological course of events, let him suspend judgment until the end of this chapter. If he feels there would be

exceptions to the rule, let him please withhold them until later.

If there have been onlookers or friends, or a public aware of these events, the effect on them of the non-violent resistance shown by C is also interesting. When the onlookers see C's courage and fortitude, his generosity and goodwill toward A, and hear his repeated offers to settle the matter fairly and peaceably and in the open, the public sympathy and support shifts slowly, or perhaps suddenly, all to C. If there are partisans of A in the crowd they find themselves in a minority. The crowd is also filled with surprise, curiosity and wonder at such unusual conduct by C. If they have been wholly hostile to him before, they at least pause to think. His good humor and fairness and kindness toward A makes them, too, trust him. If they had feared him they now lose their fear. He may suddenly win their hearty applause and complete support. His offer to seek settlement in public and his appeal to fair play perhaps tempts the onlookers to take part and exert their powers in an interesting situation. A's friends feel compelled to acquiesce or may even begin to doubt their hero. And if C maintains his goodwill, good temper and fairness

throughout the subsequent discussion and adjustment, A and his friends will be won over to admiration and friendship. If intelligence is used, a settlement can almost always be found, or a start of a means of settlement which will grow and develop and settle one item after another. The spirit in which it is undertaken, if maintained, will make for both mutual consideration and concession and for successful integration of opposing interests so that the desires and energies of both parties will find satisfaction. No resentments or feelings of fear, suspicion or revenge remain.

When a satisfactory settlement has been found, A's relief is apt to be enormous. From early in the conflict he was having misgivings and division within himself. He secretly hated the friction, the waste of energy, the loss of self-respect and public prestige. Now the way is clear, whereby he can regain both self-respect, doubly assured, and also public respect and even prestige once more. With no more internal conflict he can now put all his energies to constructive use that is beneficial to all. His happiness is thereby immensely increased, together with his enthusiasm for the new channel of action.

Just as in the first case we examined where B's reaction to A's attack was violent, so also here where C's reaction is non-violent, the effect of friends, on-lookers or other third parties upon the contestants is important for a full understanding of the matter. Both opponents feel a desire and need for the approbation of others. Social approval and opprobrium are very strong forces. They act through and are a part of the herd or gregarious instinct which is so strong in mankind.

Kempf, at pages 93, 94 and 95 of his book before cited, says:

....."In modern civilization, man having so thoroughly mastered his environment through his mechanical inventions, the individual's great struggle in life is not so much a problem of self-preservation in a physical sense as it is one of attaining social approbation and potency.

.....As society increases its care for the individual, and the individual for society...the individual grows more and more to need social esteem in order to feel safe and comfortable.....One of the most persistent causes of anxiety and depression is the fear that he has lost prestige through a blunder or a vicious indulgence."

The tremendous pressure of social approval or dislike is well brought out in W. Trotter's *Instincts of the Herd in*

Peace and War."¹ Competent observers have stated that fear of social disapproval was the strongest of all the motives to enlistment in the armies in the Great War.² The desire for approval of outsiders to a conflict was strikingly shown by the great efforts devoted to propaganda by all the parties of the Great War. Again, it is demonstrated in labor strikes and lockouts in which both parties are at great pains to win public support and sympathy. All politicians recognize the force of public opinion.

Now in this combat between A and C, as soon as the onlookers perceive C's bearing and conduct, they, too, are surprised and struck with wonder. They admire C's courage and dogged endurance. They doubt the validity of A's reasons for attacking C. A seems unreasonable. Their sympathy switches to C. Perhaps some of the timid ones vaguely fear that A might attack them next, as he seems to incline to attack wholly inoffensive persons without apparent provocation. Surely a man with such proven goodwill as C would not have hurt A before the battle

1. Macmillan, London and New York, 1916.

2. See Clive Bell—*Civilization*—pp. 221, 222, Chatto and Windus, London, 1928; also *The Motives of the Soldier* by T. H. Proctor, 31 *International Journal of Ethics*, p. 26, Oct., 1920.

ment which somehow or other will gratify as much as possible of the essence of A's original desires or what lay behind them. A is so pleased to have C's friendship instead of enmity or resentment; to find himself or at least his "better self" and potentialities respected instead of humiliated; to find the essence of his desires satisfied after all, or else so illuminated and transmuted that in their new form they may more easily be satisfied; to find C showing and inviting him to take a dignified way by which he (A) may quickly regain his *amour propre* and public esteem; that he is apt to be very friendly toward C and to help him in any way he can. A's relief to find an approved line of action may be so great as to result in actual gratitude to C. Since A has been provided with a satisfactory road for action, he is not left with any "balked disposition" as Graham Wallace calls it.¹

You may say at once, "This may be the way it happens sometimes, but there have been countless exceptions, so many that the exceptions are the rule." I grant the death of Jesus and the Christian martyrs, the tortures of Albigenses, negro lynchings, the innocent thousands slaughtered by Jenghis Khan and Tamer-

1. Graham Wallace—*The Great Society*.

lane, and countless other instances elsewhere. Those will be discussed in later chapters. Here it suffices to say that some of them, like many soldiers, won or established their causes even though they lost their own lives. Hence neither they nor their methods were any more "futile" than those of all soldiers. Perhaps most of them, however, did not show true non-violent resistance. They were undisciplined and fearful or poorly led, and were killed and partly wasted, just as any undisciplined troops would be in war.

Let me ask your patience to consider those situations later. At this point we are considering the psychological workings of non-violent resistance. There have been many cases of its effective use, as will also be shown later. But let us understand first *how violence and non-violence work* before we estimate the probabilities of their use. Most people hitherto have pooh-poohed the effectiveness of non-violent resistance simply because they could not understand how it possibly could work. Modern psychology has now made it possible to understand the emotional, mental and moral mechanisms involved. So let us analyse the matter and pay attention to one part of the problem at a time, as all scientists should.

III

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

(Continued)

FROM all the foregoing analysis we see that non-violent resistance acts as a sort of moral jiu-jitsu. The non-violence and goodwill of the victim act like the lack of physical opposition by the user of physical jiu-jitsu, to cause the attacker to lose his moral balance. He suddenly and unexpectedly loses the moral support which the usual violent resistance of most victims would render him. He plunges forward, as it were, into a new world of values. He feels helpless and insecure because of the novelty of the situation and his ignorance as to how to handle it. The principle of surprise, so potent in warfare, has made him lose his poise and self-confidence. The victim not only lets the attacker come, but, as it were, jerks him forward by kindness, generosity and goodwill, so that the attacker quite loses his moral balance. The user of non-

violent resistance, knowing what he is doing and having a more creative purpose and perhaps a clearer sense of ultimate values than the other, retains his moral balance. He uses the leverage of a superior wisdom to subdue the rough direct force or physical strength of his opponent.

Another way to state it is that between two persons in physically violent combat there may appear to be complete disagreement, but in reality they conduct their fight on the basis of a strong fundamental agreement that violence is a sound mode of procedure, in extremity at any rate. Hence if one of the parties eliminates that basic agreement and announces by his actions that he has abandoned the method used generally by his forefathers back almost to the beginning of animal life, no wonder that the other is startled and uncertain. His animal instincts no longer tell him instantly what to do. He feels that he has plunged into a new world. Here is something as new, apparently, as an airplane to an Eskimo.

To show how similar the situation is to an encounter in jiu-jitsu, let me quote briefly from *Jiu-Jitsu* by Uyenishi:¹

1. Athletic Publications, Ltd. London. See also quotation from Prof. Jigosa Kano in *Modern Review* (Calcutta) for Nov. 1922, pp. 637-8.

"Dont resist when your opponent pushes you; rather increase your pace in that direction and pull him a little at the same time, or *vice versa*, should he be pulling you. Dont let him ever get the 'strain' on you, but go with him, if anything a little faster than his pull would cause you to. By following this precept you are, if I may describe it so, almost catching your balance before he wishes you lose it, while he is practically losing his and is without the aid of your resistance on which he has been more or less depending to help him regain *his* balance. Thus in an easy and simple manner you neutralize his efforts to get you off your balance and at the same time create a favorable opportunity of effecting a throw, by keeping him off his. . . .

"... Knowledge of balance and how to disturb it, is the 'mystery' which enables the Jiu-Jitsu man so easily to throw stronger and heavier opponents without any great effort or without using strength (in the common acceptance of the term)."

It may clarify our thinking somewhat to remember that we are not considering two static entities, an angry person *vs.* a kindly person. We are rather dealing with two natures and an environment which are all mobile and changing, each constantly acting on the other—influencing, changing, then responding to the new condition thus created. The psychological doctrine of "circular response" so ably explained by Miss M. P. Follett in

her *Creative Experience*,¹ is that response is not to a fixed environment, it is rather a response to the relation created. Or as she says, (p. 62) "My changing activity is a response to an activity which is also changing. . . . My behaviour is a response to the new situation which I, in part, have created." As a reviewer of her book explained,²

"The great significance of all these aspects of circular response is to make clear the thought that a process of mutual consideration and of forward-looking co-operative planning may itself so change the elements of the situation as to point the solution. . . . An attitude of mind that is constantly inventive may go along with a process of conflict and may often use the process, as Hegel believed, for reaching a larger result than would emerge without it."

Moreover, in this process of mutual interacting influence, the non-violent person is apt to be the stronger character of the two. And the very fact that he keeps cool presently gives him more energy than the other. Undoubtedly, anger at first gives a great access of

1. Longmans Green, New York, 1924. Cf. also E. B. Holt—*Ethics of the Freudism Wish*—H. Holt & Co., New York, 1915, Chap. III, and his *The Concept of Consciousness*.

² J. H. Tufts in 35 *International Journal of Ethics* 189.

physical and sometimes mental energy.¹ But it also consumes energy very rapidly, both physiologically and nervously, and if long sustained it may completely exhaust the person feeling it.²

Thus the non-violent resister gains an advantage over the violent attacker and has a stronger chance of influencing the latter into *his* way than of being influenced into the way of rage and violence.

One event of the Great War was illustrative of another aspect of the influence of the non-violent resister, C, upon his violent attacker, A.³

Soon after the Russian Revolution, the Russian army melted away and the Bolsheviks entered into negotiations with the Austro-German generals and diplomats at Brest Litovsk, to draft terms of peace. The Bolsheviks had no power

1. W. B. Cannon—*Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage*—D. Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1927.

2. G. W. Crile—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*—W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia and New York 1915, especially pp. 30, 52, 61. Also W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., 1918, at pp. 53, 54.

3. *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia* by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky. Ed. by Louis C. Fraina, The Communist Press, New York, 1918, at pp. 353-362. Also, *Lenin* by Leon Trotsky—Minton Balch & Co., New York, 1925.

of resistance left, but they shrewdly knew of the weaknesses of the Central Powers, the seething discontent and disillusionment of the Austrian and German masses at home. A peace on the Eastern front was of immense importance to the Central Powers and indeed to the Allies, and the negotiations were given wide publicity in the German and Allied press. Boldly and cleverly the Bolsheviks argued and haggled, in reality using the negotiations to blazon forth to the German proletarian malcontents a call to rebel and mutiny against the German government. Trotsky forced the angry and over-eager General, Von Hoffman to reveal undisguised the falsehoods and annexationist purposes of the German government, and thus still further disillusioned the German and Austrian workers and weakened the unity and morale of the Central Powers. The call was indeed addressed to the workers in all countries. It resulted in a German naval mutiny and strikes among some German and Hungarian munition workers, and a general deterioration in morale freely admitted later by Generals, Von Hoffman and Ludendorf.¹

In similar fashion the kindly appeals

1. This is not cited as an example of true non-violent resistance, but as an illustration of the divisibility of the motives of a fighter even in the midst of combat.

of an individual non-violent resister work in the personality of the violent attacker, A, arousing A's more decent and kindly motives and putting them in conflict with his fighting, aggressive instincts. Thus A is made to have a divided personality. The appeals, like commercial advertising, may require considerable repetition before they are effective, but the result is pretty sure. They act on the psychological principle of "summation of stimuli."

This suggests that perhaps the whole Western world, with its fondness for violence, and yet its knowledge of Christian and Buddhist ethics, is in a state of inner conflict and disintegrated personality, and needs a sort of psychoanalysis and suggestion to free it.¹

The surprising conduct and attitude of C presents suddenly a new idea to A.² He pauses to wonder over it to try to understand it. Shand says (loc. cit. pp. 430 and 448).

"The effect of surprise is to make us attend

1. Cf. T. Burrows—*The Social basis of Consciousness*—Kegan Paul, London and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927. Perhaps this is why all modern nations, on going into war, protest that they are acting purely on the defensive.

2. Cf. W. E. Hocking—*Human Nature and its Re-making*—2d. ed. at p. 374—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., and Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

to the event that surprises us. . . Wonder tends to arrest and detain the attention on the thing which excites it. . ."

A is at the moment in a most receptive and suggestible state and the conduct of C acts on him by subconscious suggestion. Several of the conditions are present under which suggestion acts most potently. Baudouin, one of the leaders of the Nancy school of psychologists, in his book, *Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*,¹ gives at p. 143 the two following "laws of suggestion."

"1. Law of Concentrated Attention: The idea which tends to realize itself in this way is always an idea upon which spontaneous *attention* is concentrated.

"2. Law of Auxiliary Emotion: When for one reason or another, an idea is enveloped in a powerful *emotion*, there is more likelihood that this idea will be suggestively realized."

The new ideas or suggestions seem to be that the dispute can be settled calmly and amicably; that calm conduct is more dignified, more decent, more useful, more efficient, more worthy of respect than violence; that there are some values and imponderable forces in the world known

1. Translated by Eden & Ceder Paul,—Dodd, Mead & Co., New York and London, 1921.

to C and perhaps even more powerful and desirable than physical force.

Rivers says,¹ "Suggestion is essentially a process of the unconscious." Trotter also in his book previously cited says (p. 82) that sensitiveness to folk environment is instinctive and therefore subconscious. It is well known that subconscious suggestions are both powerful and lasting. The spectacle of bravely endured suffering along with all the surprises and uncertainty of the situation creates plenty of emotion in A. If there is a crowd present, this tends to heighten A's suggestibility. These suggestions tend to change the inner attitude of the attacker.

Non-violent resistance is in effect a sort of language, a means of communicating feelings and ideas. It uses the expression of the face, glances of the eyes, tones, intensities and modulations of the voice, movements and postures of the limbs and body, just as in all personal communication. In prolonged situations it may also use writing and printing. Its means of expression are as ample as those of any language. Even in situations where words can be used little or not at

1. W. H. R. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, Cambridge University Press, 1920, p. 93.

all, conduct alone may be a very rapid, accurate and efficient means of communication.¹

Nevertheless, of course, the ideas to be conveyed are so unusual that the understanding of them by the recipient may be slow or incomplete. But the understanding will be more emotional than intellectual, a matter of inner attitude, at first, anyhow. Therefore, the success of the communication does not in the slightest degree depend upon the extent of formal or book education of either party to the conflict. The idea itself is no more complex than that of war, for war involves a discipline of fear, and non-violent resistance involves a discipline of anger; and both anger and fear are elemental and very similar emotions. There is both an emotional and an intellectual element to be transmitted—both feelings and ideas. There will be difficulties arising from the unusualness of the feelings and ideas in such a situation, but no more difficulties from inadequacy of means than in the case of

1. Cf. W. B. Pillsbury and C. L. Meade—*The Psychology of Language*, p. 6.—D, Appleton & Co., New York and London, 1928.

Also E. S. Bogardus—*Fundamentals of Social Psychology*, p. 114—Century Co., New York and London, 1924.

any other sort of language.¹ It is to be remembered that boycott or non-co-operation, which may accompany or be a part of non-violent resistance, also are a sort of language or means of communication of ideas. Often the communication is singularly effective.

The new idea in the astonishing situation tends strongly to stimulate the attacker's imagination. The speed of operation of the imagination varies, of course, greatly between different people. And if the contentions of the Nancy school of psychologists be true (cf. Baudouin) in regard to the relationship between imagination and will, we gain further light in this matter. They maintain that imagination and suggestion together are much stronger than conscious will power, so that if a person consciously wills and thinks that he desires to accomplish a given purpose but all the while his imagination is filled with ideas as to his inability to accomplish it or as to some contrary desire, then he will surely fail in the task. Baudouin states it as the "Law of Reversed Effort."

1. See C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *The meaning of meaning*, 2d ed. rev., Kegan Paul, London; Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1927, especially chapters on "Sign Situations and Symbol Situations." Also, I. A. Richards—*Principles of Literary Criticism*, Ch. 21,—*Ibid.*, 1926.

"When an idea imposes itself on the mind to such an extent as to give rise to a suggestion, all the conscious efforts which the subject makes in order to counteract this suggestion are not merely without the desired effect, but they actually run counter to the subject's conscious wishes and tend to intensify the suggestion."¹

Also, "When the will and imagination are at war, the imagination *invariably* gains the day."

If this be so, it may be that the ideas thus suggested to the attacker and playing on his imagination, gradually capture his imagination and conquer his will to defeat the victim, C, by violence.

This concept is somewhat similar to that of the Freudians who show how tremendously more powerful a repressed wish is than an opposing conscious desire. Possibly a suggestion acting in the sub-consciousness is as powerful as a repressed wish.

Another reason why A is compelled to think is the powerful demonstration of C's conviction. As some writer said, "To be willing to suffer and die for a cause is an incontestable proof of sincere

1. See C. Baudouin—*Suggestion and Auto-Suggestion*, above cited. Also Ibid—*Educating the Will*—Century Magazine, New York, July, 1929.

belief, and perhaps in most cases the only incontestable proof." Strong conviction of any sort is very contagious and stimulating.

Why is it that the sight of another person voluntarily and bravely undergoing suffering for a belief or ideal so moves the spectator and tends to change his heart and make him feel a sense of kinship with the sufferer?

There are perhaps two reasons. One is this. Our ancestors from the dawn of life have suffered pain and deprivation, so extensively and so intensely in the long course of evolution, that suffering is very familiar to our entire nervous system. Indeed, it is almost habitual to the human species. Probably the nervous system is as much or more responsive or sensitive to all stimuli associated with pain and suffering than to any other type of stimulus. Hence the sight of suffering, in all probability, causes an involuntary sympathetic response in the nervous system of the beholder, especially in the autonomic system. The response may be inhibited or crusted over by custom, prejudice or hostile emotions, but it is there, nevertheless, at least in the subconsciousness. If this be so, the spectacle of a non-violent resister submitting himself

voluntarily to bodily suffering for the sake of his cause would rouse sympathetic emotion in the onlooker, and thus create an involuntary sense of kinship and unity. If the sight were prolonged or frequently repeated, the effect would be all the stronger. There seems to be a social as well as an individual subconsciousness, through which such feelings would function.¹

Again, every one wants, in their hearts, to be strong and brave. Every child has dreamed and fancied itself as being heroic in difficult or perilous situation. Therefore, when we see suffering valiantly endured, we admire the sufferer, we wonder if we could do so well, and perhaps we even unconsciously think of them as ourselves or ourselves in their place. Such processes of the imagination tend toward a feeling of sympathy and kinship.

Thus the voluntary, long sustained, steady, disciplined mass suffering of a group of non-violent resisters acts as a powerful suggestion of human unity.

Another mechanism affecting the attacker is unconscious imitation. Imita-

1. Cf. T. Burrow—*The Social Basis of Consciousness*, above cited.

tion is, of course, an exceedingly powerful force. By it we learn to walk, learn skilled manual trades, pick up gestures and postures of our elders, follow our leaders—a limitless range of conduct. As Royce says in his *Psychology*,¹

“It is by imitation that the child learns its language. It is by imitation that it acquires all the social tendencies that make it a tolerable member of society. Its imitativeness is the source of an eager and restless activity which the child pursues for years under circumstances of great difficulty, and even when the process involved seems to be more painful than pleasurable. Imitativeness remains with us through life. It attracts less of our conscious attention in our adult years, but is present in ways that the psychologist is able to observe even in case of people who suppose themselves not imitative.”

Rivers remarks at pp. 91-92 of his book above cited that “unwitting imitation is the most effective.”

Ross remarks² that “motor impulses appear to diffuse themselves with great facility,” citing the infectiousness of marching rhythm, yawning, gestures, and

1. Macmillan & Co., New York, 1903, page 276.

2. Edward Alsworth Ross—*Social Psychology*—Macmillan, New York, 1909, at pp. 120, 126, 130, 136.

Cf. also Gabriel Tarde—*The Laws of Imitation*—Chap. 6—Trans. by E. C. Parsons, Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1903.

modes of speech. Also "The feelings are more contagious than the appetites."..... "Emotions spread more rapidly than ideas or opinions."..... "Volitions are extremely communicable."

Kempf, in his book previously cited (at p. 30), after giving numerous examples of conscious and unconscious imitation, says, "The influence of associates upon the personality is a physiological mechanism and occurs unconsciously, or at least begins unconsciously." Later (p. 78) he partially adopts Holt's theory that "thought is latent course of action with regard to environment," that is to say, "the preceding labile interplay of motor settings." This suggests the reason why pupils learn better by personal discussion with the teacher than by reading a book. They can imitate unconsciously the postures, tones and play of motor settings of the teacher and thus follow and understand the thought more clearly and surely. Such a mode of influence would be both subtle and powerful. May it not help explain the change in the attacker's attitude? May it not be that as soon as he attentively watches his victim and comes to respect his courage, be it ever so little, he begins unconsciously to imitate him, and hence the attacker's wrath tends to

subside? Whatever truth there may be in the James-Lange theory of the emotions would add weight to this conjecture. For reasons already considered, the non-violent contestant is less apt to be influenced by suggestion and imitation, to adopt violence, than the violent person to be influenced toward non-violence.

If one doubts the existence of imitation in time of conflict, let him remember the words of the great theorist of war, Von Clausewitz, "War is a constant state of reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual." ¹ Again Lieut. General Von Caemmerer, in his *Development of Strategical Science*, ² says, "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects. . . . War is a constant reciprocal effect of action of both parties." ³

This factor of imitation also helps explain the futility of violence as a means of solving conflicts. If A attacks B, and B

1. Von Clausewitz—*On War*—Trans. by Col J. J. Graham, Kegan Paul, London, 1911, vol. I, p. 99.

2. Translated—Hugh Rees, Ltd. London, 1905, at p. 78.

3. Perhaps further light may be thrown on all this by further study of unconscious mental processes and their relation to the conscious. Cf. *The Psychology of Emotion* by John T. MacCurdy—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1925.

responds with violence, while part of B's response is purely instinctive and defensive, part of it also is unconscious imitation of A. Then the two act like front and back logs in a fire. The heat of one log is reflected across to the other, which then fires up and sends more heat to the first. The heat is reflected back and forth, steadily increasing and consuming the material (latent energy) of the wood. So anger, resentment, hatred and revenge, in the process of reciprocal imitative violence, mount higher and enter into more and more of the personalities of the combatants, consuming all their energies, to the point of utter exhaustion or destruction.

Von Clausewitz, above quoted, says at p. 102.

"A hostile feeling is kindled by the combat itself; for an act of violence which anyone commits upon us by order of his superior will excite in us a desire to retaliate and be revenged on him, sooner than on the superior power at whose command the act was done. This is human, or animal if we will; still it is so. We are very apt to regard the combat in theory as an abstract trial of strength, without any participation on the part of the feelings, and that is one of the thousand errors which theorists deliberately commit, because they do not see its consequences."

The psychological nature of non-

violent resistance may well be considered a form of what Rivers calls "manipulative activity." In discussing different modes of reaction to danger, he says,¹

"In the presence of danger man, in the vast majority of cases, neither flees nor adopts an attitude of aggression, but responds by the special kind of activity, often of a highly complex kind, whereby the danger may be avoided or overcome. From most of the dangers to which mankind is exposed in the complex conditions of our own society, the means of escape lie in complex activities of a manipulative kind which seem to justify the term I have chosen. The hunter has to discharge his weapon, perhaps combined with movements which put him into a favourable situation for such an action. The driver of a car and the pilot of an aeroplane in danger of collision have to perform complex movements by which the danger is avoided."

We may say that C's non-violent resistance is a sort of moral manipulative activity in which the factors used and operated upon are largely psychological.

What must be the character of the non-violent resister in order that he may use his weapon effectively? What must be in his mind and heart?

He must have primarily that disposition best known as love; an interest in

1. W. H. R. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*—Cambridge University Press, 1920, p. 54.

people so deep, and determined, and lasting as to be creative; a profound knowledge of or faith in the ultimate possibilities of human nature; a courage based probably upon a conscious or sub-conscious realization of the underlying unity of all life and eternal values or eternal life of the human spirit; a strong and deep desire for and love of truth; and a humility which is not cringing or self-deprecatory or timid but rather a true sense of proportion in regard to people, things, qualities and ultimate values. These may sound very philosophical and rare, but in fact they are all quite common human traits—love, faith, courage, honesty, and humility. They exist in greater or less strength and clearness in *every* person. The problem of developing them to use in non-violent resistance will be considered later. If you protest that you cannot love your enemies, please patiently postpone this objection till chapter XII where it will be discussed with many other queries.

The most important of all these factors is love. It may almost be considered the origin of all the others. If the name "love" in such a context seems to you as too impossible or repulsively sentimental, call it a sort of intelligence

or knowledge. It must be strong and clear-sighted, not mawkish or silly-sentimental. It does not hint or imply in a priggish or superior manner that it is going to "do good to" the other person, nor does it make a parade of itself. It must be patient and full of insight and understanding and imagination. It must be enduring, kind and unselfish. We have all seen such love in many mothers of all ranks, classes, nations and races, also in the best teachers. It is wonderful, but it is not super-human or exceedingly rare. Its creativeness in these instances is well known.

The creative aspect of love was well expressed by that very original philosopher, Charles S. Peirce—"Love, recognizing germs of loveliness in the hateful, gradually warms it into life, and makes it lovely." ¹ W. E. Hocking also finely describes it on pages 374-75 of his *Human Nature and its Remaking*. ²

. . . "And the persistent refusal to criticise or to retaliate . . . must mean that the self which has defects or which does injury is seen to be other than

1. Charles S. Peirce—*Chance, Love and Logic*—Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, and Kegan Paul, London, 1923.

2. Yale University Press, New Haven (U.S.A.) and Oxford University Press, London, 1923.

the real self; and the non-resistance constitutes an appeal from the apparent self to the real self, or from the actual self to the self that may be. In this case, it is not injustice, but it is justice to the living and changeable. . . . Greek justice, distributive or retributive, took men statically, as they presented themselves. This type of justice refuses to take a man at his own estimate of himself; it insists on the self of a more nearly absolute estimate, the self that *must* be, and which this resolve of the non-resisting will will help to bring into being. It is a justice done for the first time to the plasticity and responsiveness of human nature toward our own wills; it is an absolute or creative justice."

Again, if by your love for your enemy you can create respect in him, a respect or admiration for you, this provides the best possible means by which your new idea or suggestion to him will become an auto-suggestion within him, and it will also help nourish that auto-suggestion.

Still another aspect of this creativeness of love was described in an article by G. F. Barbour, called "Force and the Conquest of Evil in Christian Ethics." ¹

. . . "The dynamic of love, of trust, and of an appeal to the sense of honour, though its action may be slow and uncertain at the outset, acts permanently, if it acts at all, by passing over into the heart and the character of its object. This principle . . .

1. 15 Hibbert Journal, 464, at p. 470.

has seldom found finer expression than in the words of Spinoza :—

“‘He who chooses to avenge wrong with hatred is assuredly wretched. But he who strives to conquer hatred with love fights his battle in joy and confidence ; he withstands many as easily as one, and has very little need of fortune's aid. Those whom he vanquishes yield joyfully, not through failure, but through increase in their power.’”

The creative power of love often acts as follows : When X has been indifferent to Y and then suddenly discovers that Y loves him, he (X) is at first ashamed, perhaps because Y was the more magnanimous and first to love. Further, X is ashamed to accept Y's love. These two phases may last a relatively long time. But when Y makes X feel that he is needed, and shows X how he can help Y, how he has abilities that can be useful, then X's stubbornness and pride melt fast and he begins to love Y and to help him. Very few people can bear merely to accept love. In order to be comfortable, they must be shown how they can return it.

Anger, as well as love, can be creative, for both are expressions or modes of energy. But love contains more energy and endurance than anger. Love as a sentiment is more inclusive and attracts

to itself more energies than anger. Love involves the very principle and essence of continuity of life itself. Love is more lasting. If considered as an instrument, it can be more efficiently and effectively wielded; has better aim; has a better fulcrum or point of vantage, than anger. Love gains a stronger and more lasting approval from the rest of mankind. The probabilities in favor of its winning over anger in the long run are strong.

Please note that at this point I am not saying that everyone has or will have a feeling of love for his opponents. I am merely saying that such love is essential for completely successful individual non-violent resistance. It is the mode of action of that method which we are now trying to understand.

If, as a matter of fact, however, one party to a contest cannot develop any such creative attitude toward the conflict or toward his opponent, he should certainly be honest and true to himself. As Hocking says,¹

“Unless I am, in fact, so much of a seer to be a lover of my enemy, it is both futile and false to assume the behaviour of love: we can generally rely on the enemy to give such conduct its true name.”

I. Loc. cit. p. 376.

De Madariaga expresses detestation for "the person who goes about feeling like Bismark and speaking like Jesus Christ." ¹ Mr. Gandhi said in reference to such a situation, "If you have a sword in your bosom, take it out and use it like a man," meaning of course that if you really wish to injure your enemy physically, then do it courageously. Christ disliked hypocrisy exceedingly, and perhaps this explains the fact that he did not explicitly forbid war itself. As long as men have uncontrollable anger and enmity in their feelings, it is better to express it honestly and courageously than to be hypocritical and refuse to fight out of cowardice. Christ was searching for a change more profound and important than immediate external acts. He told men to get rid of fear and anger and greed, knowing that if this took place, war would disappear.

Not to use violence because you are afraid is worse than to use violence. He who refrains from fighting because he is afraid, really hates his enemy in his heart and wishes that circumstances would change so that he could hurt or destroy his opponent. Hence the energy of his

1. Salvador de Madariaga—*Disarmament*—Conrad—McCann, Inc., New York, 1929, p. 362.

hate is only suppressed because he does not use it. But he who has courage to fight and yet refrains is the true non-violent resister. Because the coward fears he cannot love, and if he cannot love, he cannot be wholly successful in non-violent resistance. The psychological reason for that will appear as we go along.

As to whether and how men may learn to love their enemies despite an initial instinctive anger, we will discuss hereafter. The practice of non-violent resistance by groups will be considered in chapters V and VI. The matter of non-violent resistance to theft or economic oppression will also be carefully discussed in a subsequent chapter.

IV

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

(concluded)

WE may now consider why a psychologically sounder method of solving a conflict is found in non-violent resistance than in reciprocal violence.

The first reason is partly physiological. It is because anger, hatred, rage and fear are such an enormous drain on our energy.¹ Hatred eats up our energies and our feelings and imaginations. If you hate a man sufficiently, you cannot get him out of your mind; you are attached to him; you are his slave. The thought of him is an obsession; it wastes most of your time. Anger is highly inefficient in both method and results.

If you would conquer another man, do it not by outside resistance but by

1. Cf. Crile and Hocking previously cited.

creating inside his own personality an impulse too strong for his previous tendency. That is to say, reinforce your suggestion by making it become auto-suggestion in him, so that it lives by his energy instead of by yours. And yet that new impulse is not to conflict directly with his former urge, but to divert and blend with it and absorb it, so as to use the full psychological energy of both impulses. That is the wisest psychological dynamics and moral strategy.

The non-violent resister does not want a passive compliance from the attacker, such as would be secured by using successful counter-violence against him. He wants the full energy of the attacker's active help. Therefore he tries to make it easy and pleasant for the attacker to join forces in the new programme. He knows that the pattern of a peaceful stimulus to the violent one is more harmonious, more "voluminous," and therefore more potent and efficient than a violent, i.e., intense and painful, stimulus would be.¹

The non-violent resister has to expend much energy, but he applies it more

1. See Wm. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*—Kegan Paul, London, and Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1928, especially pp. 160-169, Chap. 13, and pp. 377-379.

intelligently than does the violent man. He selects the really important forces in the environment and seeks to alter them.¹ The angry and violent man is short-sighted. He puts too much emphasis on immediate objects and too little on the ultimate impelling forces behind them. Or if he considers impelling forces, he does not analyze them sufficiently or go far enough back. He has to waste much energy because, as it were, he uses too short leverages in attempting to move or divert the opposing objects or forces. The non-violent resister, by using longer psychological leverages, may have to move more slowly sometimes, but the work is more efficiently done and tends to be more permanent.

W. A. White, a well-known American psychiatrist, in his book, *Mechanisms of Character Formation*,² speaking of conflicting desires or tendencies within an individual person, says (p. 274)—

“It follows from all this that the symbolization of the conflict, either in the dream or in the symptoms of the neurosis or psychosis, will contain elements representative of both factors, and also that no solution of the conflict can come about

1. Cf. Marston, above cited, Chap. XVII.

2. Macmillan, New York, 1916. See also pp. 73 and 278.

except by the satisfaction of both these diametrically opposed tendencies. It follows, too, that no conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict. That is, two mutually opposed tendencies can never unite their forces except at a higher level, in an all inclusive synthesis which lifts the whole situation to a level above that upon which the conflict rose."

Although Dr. White is here speaking of a conflict within the individual personality, it would hardly be disputed that the words would also apply to a conflict between two persons. You have the same clash of opposing streams or centres of energy. A solution which involves repression of one stream of energy would result, as all Freudians and people of wide experience agree, in trouble sooner or later. The repressed energy, the thwarted or defeated person, sooner or later will find an outlet, a sort of revenge.

It may be very indirect and not recognizable in its ultimate form. But it will come as surely as the laws of energetics hold true.

There is great wisdom in his two statements:—

"No conflict can be solved at the level of the conflict. That is, two mutually opposed tendencies can never unite their forces except at a higher level, in an all inclusive synthesis which lifts the whole situation to a level above that upon which the conflict rose."

Mutual physical violent struggle is an attempt to solve a contest "at the level of the conflict." The defeat of either party results in suppression or repression of the energy of the wishes or will of the defeated party. That inevitably results in waste and friction, often in revenge. Whereas non-violent resistance, followed up with moderate wisdom, bids fair to find a solution which will give satisfactory scope for the energies of both parties. Often it will enhance their energies, as a result of the subsequent good feeling. New associations will open up new channels for pleasurable and fruitful activity. A synthesis of both energies is similar to what the Freudians call a "sublimation."

It is substantially what Miss M. P. Follett calls "integration." In her very thoughtful book, *Creative Experience*,¹ she has the most thorough and interesting discussion I have seen of the psychological principles involved in making wise settlements of conflicts. Discussing settlements of conflicts, she shows that either voluntary submission of one side, struggle and victory of one side over the other, or a compromise, are all highly unsatisfactory and productive of further trouble.

1. Longmans Green, New York, 1924. p. 157 *et seq.*

She then explains a fourth way, "integration."

Intergration is arrived at by first analyzing the expressed desires or intentions of the opponents into their elements and more fundamental meanings. For instance, to take a simple case, an insistence on having a table in a certain place in a room might really mean a wish to have light on one's writing while working at the table, together with an inability to see how it could be secured in any other way. The desire of Russia to control the Dardanells may really mean a desire for security in free trade. Insistence upon a given kind of trade may mean a need for employment, a desire for money, and a desire to satisfy pride. An insistence upon political control of a certain territory may mean a need for food and industrial raw material and a desire to satisfy pride, and an inability to see how the satisfaction of these needs can be made wholly secure in any other way.

The integration consists of inventing and working out a wholly new solution, perhaps involving very different activities, which satisfies all or most of the fundamental desires and needs of both parties in the situation, and utilizes freely and fully the energies of both without

balking or supression. One can imagine how a need for food or security which has been stated and exercised in one set form, involving constraint of the freedom of a certain person, might be attained in another way which would release that person's energies entirely and still guarantee the fundamental security of the other. Science has helped us to see that there are many possibilities in any situation. The integration requires preliminary analysis, then an invention of a new solution which gives free scope to the energies of all parties concerned. Inevitably the solution is satisfying all around.

She faces the fact that it takes much creative intelligence and ingenuity to find integrations, and admits that not all differences can be integrated immediately. Temporary compromises could be made, however, pending the further search and alterations due to passage of time, ending in an ultimate integration.

At page 171 she continues :

“ The confronting of diverse interests, each claiming right of way, leads us to evaluate our interests; and valuation often is evolved into revaluation..... The revaluation of interests comes about in various ways. Consider what influences a change of opinion in regard to the League of Nations :

(1) Changes in the situation which make me see my interests differently, (2) changes in myself caused by

the situation, (3) other things which may give me a deeper understanding of this situation, (4) values when put together look different from the same values considered separately, for in the act of comparison there is a simultaneous view of all values in the field which register themselves in their relative claims, they acquire perspective. Values depend largely on relation. Certain values emerge as values when we are thinking of joining the League of Nations which we should not have considered if that question had not arisen."

In this connection it is well to remember the importance of love. Love for an opponent makes possible the sympathetic appreciation of the real meaning and value of the opponent's contentions, positions, and desires, and gives a willingness to approach them open-mindedly, and thus creates the right atmosphere for an integration of both sets of interests to a higher plane of action. Also it induces a frame of mind in the opponent which leads him to understand *your* needs, contentions, etc. And it shows the opponent that you are so appreciative of his side of the case that he can safely trust you. In the psychological jiu-jitsu, love is needed to guide matters to a successful issue.

Miss Follett's idea of integration indicates that non-violent resistance, as an attitude or method, by itself does not necessarily settle all the conflict. It may

be said to solve most of the emotional part—the fear, anger, pride, etc.—while the rest of the conflict may have to be solved by keen and perhaps prolonged intellectual exploration, with the new emotional attitude always at its elbow to help over the tight places.

These quotations from White and Follett also make it clear why love is the most important factor in the attitude of the non-violent resister. We may state it somewhat as follows:—

If we are to find something which will overcome anger and fear, it must be in principle the opposite of them and stronger than they are. Usually we think of courage as the opposite of fear. But really courage is only a partial antithesis. Courage implies a readiness to fight, to risk oneself, to match strength against strength, intelligence against intelligence. Courage, like anger, implies an attempt to end the threat of the opposing force or person by driving it away, making it submissive or destroying it, but does not usually imply rising above it and utilizing its energy in a higher synthesis. That is to say, courage implies willingness to engage in conflict on the same plane in which the threatening force is found, perhaps because of an estimation

of superior strength or perhaps because of a consciousness of or faith in a higher security, and this means trying to suppress the energy of the force opposed. But love involves not only a willingness to take risks and face the threatening force, but also a desire and usually an ability to lift the conflict to a higher plane, and in that higher plane *utilizing* the energy of the opposing force in a higher integration or sublimation. Love is stronger than fear and anger; for one reason, because it is able to manipulate and guide their energy. It is more intelligent and far-seeing, as it were. It is also stronger because it is a more inclusive sentiment than fear or anger or hate, as has already been explained. Love means using in the moral sphere the principle of the resolution of forces, known to every schoolboy who has studied physics, instead of the wasteful principle of direct opposition and consequent waste of energy and unsatisfactory and only temporary results. Love does something better than conquer, for conquest implies destruction, submission and suppression. But love is more intelligent and tries not to allow any energy to go to waste.

In so far as life is made up of a flow

of energy, any principle is sound which increases the flow of energy, and makes possible the joining and mutual reinforcement of two or more channels of energy. An increase of life energy gives power and joy.

So love is a great principle in moral mechanics. It does not suppress or thwart the energy behind fear and anger but uses it, and finds ways to steer it into channels desirable to both parties to the conflict. Fear and anger both involve, as we have seen, an idea of separation, a flight or a driving away or extinction. Love, on the other hand, involves the idea of unity and attraction. It is therefore the true opposite, the sound principle by which to eliminate fear, anger, pride, and all other divisive emotions and attitudes. This makes it clear, perhaps, why it has been said that "Perfect love casteth out fear."

From all this it seems fairly clear that from a psychological and long-time point of view, non-violent resistance is socially and politically desirable because of its *efficiency*.¹

When we come to consider the

1. Cf. John Dewey—*Force and Coercion*—26 International Journal of Ethics 360—367, April, 1916.

history and evolution of the instinct of pugnacity we find further assurance of the validity of the method of non-violent resistance.

Hocking, in his *Human Nature and its Remaking* already cited, has at pp. 188-191 an exceedingly interesting discussion of this point which may be summarized as follows :—

In its original and crudest form pugnacity requires the destruction of its object. But with the higher animals and man, destruction results in a partial defeat of one's total wish. The conqueror has enough interest in the survival of his opponent to want to see its chagrin and its acknowledgment of him as victor. The feeling, 'I want destruction,' become 'I want revenge.' But revenge likes to nurse itself and persist, and this tends toward prolonging the vanquished's life so as to enjoy his discomfiture to the utmost. And the intensity of hatred in the victims of ruthless revenge becomes a danger. So revenge develops into punishment. Punishment tries to inflict pain but without permanent injury. It discriminates between the *evil* of will of the opponent and the will itself, just as revenge distinguished between the will and the life. Punishment tries to

get rid of "an evil element in the will of another while retaining the integrity of, and the regard for that will as a whole." The next step was a sort of therapeutic improvement, a discovery of a better way to cure an evil or defective element in an opponent's will. Punishment always resulted in some degree of bitterness or hatred, which interfered with the cure of the will. It was discovered that kindness and friendliness induce a desire in the opponent's own mind and heart to get rid of the defect or difficulty, a sort of auto-suggestion which was most efficient. Thus long continued experience has brought the shrewdest men to realize that the earlier and cruder expressions of pugnacity and anger "are not what the human being, on the whole, wants." What a person really wants is the richest and fullest possible expression of its energy, and to attain that completely there must be an equally rich and full expression of energy by all other persons. Such is the evolution of the instinct of pugnacity.¹

1. It is interesting to compare this evolution of the instinct of pugnacity with the evolution of the weapons of warfare as described in Col. J. F. C. Fuller's—*The Reformation of War*—Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., London, 1923. He argues strongly for the use of poison gas in warfare on the ground that it causes the smallest possible amount of destruction of life and property consistent with imposing one's will upon the enemy.

W. Trotter, in his *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*,¹ after describing the usual prejudices against non-violence and the idea that it would create degeneration and disaster, goes on to say (p. 125):—

“The doctrine of pacifism is a perfectly natural development, and ultimately inevitable in an animal having an unlimited appetite for experience and an indestructible inheritance of social instinct.”...

And at p. 123:—

“Altruism...is a characteristic of the gregarious animal, and is a perfectly normal and necessary development in him of his instinctive inheritance... The biologist...is aware that altruism...is the direct outcome of instinct, and that it is a source of strength because it is a source of union.”

And much more to the same effect, with comments on how these developments are always received with obloquy and derision and often by persecution by the more short sighted members of the herd. Apparently certain instincts are of more use to the herd at an early stage of its development than at a later stage.

In all the preceding discussion we have been thinking of a conflict between only two persons, in order to simplify and thereby better understand our prob-

lem. In subsequent chapters we will discuss its application to the rearing and education of children, the care of lunatics and irresponsible people, instances where killing takes place and where greater matters are at stake ; conflicts between an individual and a group, or between groups, complex encounters such as strikes, class war, lynching, judicial trial and punishments, civil war, international war.

But in any event the discussion of these chapters seems to suggest that perhaps the East, as expressed by Buddha, Hindu ethics, the Jainas, Lao Tsu, Christ and Gandhi, has studied psychology and "behaviourism" more profoundly than any modern Westerners have yet succeeded in doing. The terminology may be different, but that does not make the conclusions less wise. The dense populations and prolonged ages of intense social experience of India, China and other Asiatic civilizations brought about an insight and realization of the psychological validity of non-violent resistance. Modern development of swift means of communication and transportation, the shocks and suffering of the Great War, and the researches of Western psychology are perhaps tending to have the same effect

as the dense population and long-sustained experience of the East; thus, maybe, preparing the Western mind to realize the same truth.

Of course, there is much more than I have been able to express. That is for future workers to elucidate.

NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE AS A METHOD OF WAR

ALL the great authorities on the art and science of war agree that the ultimate object of war is to impose one's will upon the enemy.

Thus Von Clausewitz in his famous treatise, *On War*,¹ says (Vol. I, p. 2)

"War therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfil our will..... Violence, that is to say, physical force...is therefore the *means*; the compulsory submission of the enemy to our will is the ultimate object. In order to attain this object fully, the enemy must be disarmed, and disarmament becomes therefore the immediate object of hostilities in theory."

Again, Marshall Foch, commander in chief of all the Allied forces in the Great War, in his book *The principles of*

1. Translated by Col. J. J. Graham, Kegan Paul, London, 1911.

*War*¹ says at page 311: "Modern war, to arrive at its ends, imposes its will upon the adversary."

Nor have the lessons and developments of the Great War altered this belief. For instance, Col. J. F. C. Fuller, D. S. O., in his book, *The Reformation of War*,² although he is strongly in favor of using the newest devices of war, such as disabling gas, airplanes, tanks and a mechanized army, nevertheless agrees with Clausewitz and Foch as to the ultimate goal and objective of war. It does not make any difference what the war is "about," the ultimate purpose is the same. In proof of this it is interesting to note that the above statements are agreed to by Leon Trotsky, the organizer of the Russian "Red" Army,³ and by Sun Tse, the old Chinese authority on war, who wrote his treatise 2400 years ago.⁴

Von Clausewitz states that "there are three principal objects in carrying on

1. American ed. Trans. by Major J. DeMorinni, H. K. Fly Co., New York, 1918 (reference is to pages in American ed.) English ed.—Trans. by H. Belloc. French ed. Berger—Levrault, Paris, 1917.

2. Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., London, 1923 at page 95.

3. L. Trotsky—*The Defense of Terrorism*—pp. 51-52 Allen & Unwin, London, 1921.

4. Sun Tse on *The Art of War*—Trans. by L. Giles Luzac & Co., London, 1910.

war" and that one of these is "to gain public opinion."¹ That of course was the object of all the propaganda in the Great War. The immensely greater part that propaganda played then in comparison with previous wars shows the increasing importance of public opinion in modern war.² In respect to the value it gives to this "imponderable," non-violent resistance resembles war, though it seeks the object by different methods.

Marshal Foch, in his book above cited, also shows very clearly that the method of war is primarily psychological, or what he calls "moral." At page 314 he says :—

"Where shall we find the method whose existence is now evident? Will it consist in the number of enemies killed? Is it a question of doing more harm by having more guns and more rifles, or better guns and better rifles than the enemy? Is superiority found merely in material advantages, or does it come from other causes? We must seek the answer in an analysis of the psychological phenomenon of battle."

After giving numerous examples he concludes :—(p. 316)

1. Loc. cit. Vol. III, p. 209.

2. See Will Irwin—*The Art of Muddledment*—Scribners Magazine, New York, Oct. 1929.

"Proofs and instances could be given indefinitely of that great importance of morale in war. Von der Goltz himself tells us that 'it is not so much a question of destroying the enemy troops as of destroying their courage. Victory is yours as soon as you convince your opponent that his cause is lost.' And again, 'one defeats the enemy not by individual and complete annihilation, but by destroying his hopes of victory!'"

Marshal de Saxe said: "The secret of victory lies in the hearts of human beings."¹ Napoleon said, "In war, the moral is to the physical as three is to one." Von Caemmerer, speaking of Von Clausewitz's book on war, says,² "As he pictures war, the struggle between the spiritual and moral forces on both sides is the centre of all."

Thus we see that war is, in both purpose and method, ultimately psychological, or what Foch calls *moral*. Hence it would seem that non-violent resistance is perhaps in this respect more like war than we had imagined. Though war uses violence, the effect it aims at is psychological. Non-violent resistance also aims

1. Sir Ian Hamilton, *The Soul and Body of the Army*, P. 134, Edw. Arnold, London, 1921.

2. Lt. General Von Caemmerer, *The Development of Strategical Science*, Translated. Publ. by Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905.

at and secures psychological effects, though by different means.

Are there any other resemblances between war and non-violent resistance? Let us see.

Von Clausewitz's principles of war have been summarized¹ as follows:

"Retaining the initiative, using the defensive as the decisive form of action, concentration of force at the decisive point, the determination of that point, the superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources, the proper relation between attack and defense, and the will to victory."

Other authorities state them somewhat differently, Foch, for instance, laying more stress on the offensive. Nevertheless, Von Clausewitz is still regarded as one of the master minds in the art of warfare.

When we examine the above principles of grand strategy, we see that they all apply to non-violent resistance as well as to war. Let us discuss them.

We have seen in the previous chapters that the non-violent resister begins an entirely new line of conduct. He seizes and maintains the moral initiative. He

1. See article on "Air Power" by A. A. Walser, in *The 19th Century* for April 1923, p. 598.

uses the principle of surprise most effectively. Foch says of this,¹

"The way to destroy the enemy's morale, to show him that his cause is lost, is therefore surprise in every sense of the word, bringing into the struggle something 'unexpected and terrible,' which therefore has a great effect. It deprives the enemy of the power to reflect, and consequently to discuss.

"It may be some new engine of war, possessed of novel powers of destruction, but that cannot be created at will.".....

We will let Foch have his terror because he is talking of violent war, but we submit that the rest of the quotation applies equally strongly to the practice of non-violent resistance; and may not non-violent resistance be regarded as a "new engine of war?" Furthermore, all through the course of the encounter to the final settlement, we have seen that the non-violent resister is using tactics which maintain his initiative throughout. Von Clausewitz said, "Surprise plays a much greater part in strategy than in tactics; it is the most powerful element of victory."²

Lord Nelson said,³

1. Loc. Cit. P. 318.

2. Loc. Cit. Vol. III. P. 210.

3. Letter of Mar. 24, 1801, Nelson's Letters & Dispatches, Vol. IV, P. 295.

"The measure may be thought bold, but I am of opinion the boldest are the safest."

And in the Prize Essay of the Royal United Service Institution for 1928, by Lt. Commander J. D. Prentice, we find the following passages :—¹ (p. 235)

"The introduction of new and untried manoeuvres has always been looked upon with distrust ; yet it is only by some such introduction that a tactical surprise can be brought about....

(p. 237)

"In order to attain surprise of whatever kind, security must be disregarded to a certain extent : risks must be taken. Whether it be the risk of pinning your faith upon some new and untried weapon, or of executing some apparently dangerous manoeuvre in the face of the enemy, or of weakening your forces in one part of the world in order to bring about a surprise concentration in another, that risk must be accepted. The greater the outward appearance of that risk, the greater will be the advantage gained by the resultant surprise....

(p. 239)

"The best way to attain surprise is to do something which is apparently too risky, something which is, in the eyes of the enemy, an abandonment of security."

How apt all this is, in principle, to the surprise obtained by non-violent

I. Journal of Royal United Service Institution, May, 1929, Whitehall, London.

resistance. The surprise of non-violent resistance is effective partly because it is unexpected and partly because the opponent is so bound by his violent habits that he is ill-prepared to utilize the new tactics himself. He is like a wrestler using European methods pitted against a Japanese using Jiu-Jitsu.

This item from the principles of sea fighting suggests that the psychological advantage gained from the adoption of non-violent resistance is analogous to that derived from a sudden change of land base in naval warfare. The moral base of non-violent resistance is very different from that of violence.

Napoleon stated,¹

"It is an approved maxim in war, never to do what the enemy wishes you to do, for this reason alone, that he desires it. A field of battle, therefore, which he has previously studied and reconnoitred, should be avoided, and double care should be taken where he has had time to fortify and entrench. One consequence deducible from this principle is, never to attack a position in front which you can gain by turning."

Non-violent resistance acts fully in accord with this principle. Your violent opponent wants you to fight in the way to which he is accustomed. If you utterly

1 Napoleon's *Maxims of War*, Maxim XVI.

decline, and adopt a method wholly new to him, you have thereby gained an immediate tactical advantage. Again, non-violent resistance is not a direct counter-attack of force directly opposed to force. It is more of an indirect or flanking movement. Even in a mechanical resolution of forces a way may always be found to turn a direct opposition into several lines of force at a different angle. Flanking movements have achieved successes all through the history of warfare. They are very sound strategy. So much for the principles of initiative and surprise.

As to "using the defensive as the decisive form of action," the non-violent resister in his external actions agrees with Von Clausewitz; but in respect to his psychological energies he agrees with Foch; he is constantly "attacking," as it were, that is, energetically seeking the psychological road for a truly satisfactory solution of the conflict. His energy is not used so much in opposition as in trying to open new and adequate and wise channels for the energies of both his opponents and himself to unite in and flow on together, and in removing defects from his own position. The resistance of non-violent resistance is not directed

against the *energy* of the opponent's desires but merely against their immediate form or method. It seeks to discover for him a new and wiser channel for his energy.

Yet this does not mean reducing the conflict to a tame debating society. Although sometimes a safe and easy issue of the conflict may be found, the non-violent resister may feel assured of a fair probability that he will sooner or later have to suffer physically, in hardships anyway, and perhaps by wounds, imprisonment and sometimes death. We assume, you see, that he is really in earnest, really believes in his cause, is ready to sacrifice for it, and is no more a coward than any soldier is. He must take risks. This is a real adventure—no parlour make-believe for softies or pretenders or boasters.

But non-violent resistance differs in one psychological respect from war. The object is not to make the opponent believe that he is crushed and beaten and humiliated, but to persuade him to realize that he can perhaps attain security, self-respect, comfort or whatever else his ultimate desire may be by easier and wiser and surer means than he saw formerly. The effort is furthermore to help him work out such new means, not

rigidly or on any *a priori* plan, but flexibly in accordance with the deepest growing truth of the entire situation in all its bearings. The opponent's courage is not destroyed, but merely his belief that his will and desire must be satisfied in *his* way alone is altered, and he is led to see the situation in a broader, more fundamental and far-sighted way, so as to work out a solution which will satisfy or more nearly satisfy both parties.

One might say that non-violent resistance is, externally, a warfare of position, like most of the Great War, while internally or psychologically it is warfare of movement, like earlier wars.

Does the non-violent resister "concentrate his force at the decisive point," and is he active in "the determination of that point?" He certainly is. He decides, with Marshal de Saxe, that "the secret of victory lies in the heart of human beings," that is, that it is a matter of psychology. Therefore, he concentrates upon the psychological forces in the situation, and deals with them as efficiently, and powerfully as he possibly can. And in so far as concentration means bringing strength to bear against weakness, he does that also, for in this moral or psychological field he is

far more prepared and stronger than his opponent.

We need not dilate further upon the belief and action of the non-violent resister, in respect to the principle of the "superiority of the moral factor to purely material resources." He acts more sincerely upon that principle than did any soldier ever yet born.

"The proper relation between attack and defense" has been very searchingly considered by the non-violent resister. He knows that the best relation of all between these two energies is not one of opposition but of resolution, integration and sublimation. He thus enables both sides to win, and conquers both his own possible short-sightedness of aim and that of his enemy at the same time. The result is not a triumphant victor on the one side and a despondent, repressed vanquished on the other. Both sides are happy in the joint victory of their more important selves and the common defeat of their mistakes.

Does the non-violent resister have the "will to conquer" which Foch calls "the first condition of victory?"¹ He surely does. Indeed, he must have an

1. See his *Principles of War*, p. 316.

indomitable will to victory in order to endure the suffering put upon him. Moreover, he has a stronger incentive to win this way than the ordinary soldier has for war, for by this new way the final result is *sure* and settled permanently, and with a great release of energy and happiness for all concerned. No aftermath of resentment, hatred, bitterness, or revenge. No necessity for further threats or force.

One principle of war that Foch stresses is that of economy of forces. Non-violent resistance is in accord, for it conserves and utilizes more of both physical and emotional and intellectual force or energy than do the methods of anger and physical struggle. It tends to immobilize the enemy who relies too much on physical force or terror, while preserving its own freedom and initiative.

Admiral Mahan said that "communications dominate war," and some modern authorities lay great stress on the importance of "intelligence" (*i. e.*, information) in war. But in the psychological realm it may be said that non-violent resistance depends far less on communications and detailed information about your enemy's movements than does violent war. Non-violent resistance

operates more in a non-spatial realm of ideas, attitudes and feelings and therefore does not so much require constant communications in Mahan's sense of the word. The non-violent resister already has available the most important information of all, namely, as to how the human heart and mind work. He can rely on that to carry him very far.

Other writers would add mobility and endurance as important principles of military strategy. The mobility of the non-violent resister is both physical and psychological—chiefly the latter. It lies mainly in his active searching and exploring constantly for new and better roads for the adjustment and settlement of the given conflict. His imagination and practical inventiveness are constantly on the alert. He is not fixed or dogmatic in regard to the details of any settlement. He keeps an open mind and is as ready to adopt his opponent's suggestions as his own or anyone else's, for the settlement, provided they are compatible with the whole truth of the situation.

That he exercises endurance and takes steps to provide for it goes without saying after all our previous discussion.

Those to whom non-violent resistance

seems too purely defensive or passive to permit its being considered a method of war will do well to remember how the Russians defeated Napoleon by passively retreating into the heart of their country. As Lt. General Von Caemmerer points out,¹

“The greatest success which the defense has ever secured was gained in this way in 1812; the *complete* annihilation of the truly enormous offensive army commanded by the most powerful and at the same time most experienced and most determined representative of strategic offensive was here the reward of such a method. Napoleon's world-empire, as a matter of fact, was wrecked by the *strength of the defence.*”

Of course, such tactics entail some great losses. Von Caemmerer, in the same paragraph also says,

“The farther back the point is situated on which the defence strives to bring about a favourable turn of affairs, the more territory, it is true, falls meanwhile into the hands of the assailant, and has to bear all the miseries of war; but then also the greater will be, of course, the consequences of the victory gained by the defence, and the more terrible will be the reverse for the assailant who has moved so far away from his own country.”²

1. *The Development of Strategical Science.* (Trans.) Publ. by Hugh Rees, Ltd., London, 1905., p. 108.

2. See also Von Clausewitz, *On War*, in regard to defence as an important part of strategy.

We may say that in an encounter against non-violent resisters, the violent attackers get further and further away from their moral base, their self-respect (founded on truth) and the respect of others for them; and the non-violent resisters come closer and closer to the ultimate truth about themselves and their own cause, which is, so to say, the heart of their country. People who regard this analogy lightly will do well to remember that it was the imponderables which really won the Great War.

It might be urged that none of the above analogies can be valid because we have transferred the psychology of a conflict between two individuals to the case of a conflict between groups or between an individual and a group, and that such a change of conditions would wholly alter the psychology of the situation. There would of course be some alteration, but not enough, I think, to invalidate the analogies, for the following reason. The psychological factors upon which non-violent resistance works in the individual are such as are common to all mankind. They are to a much slighter extent those in which there is great variation between persons, such as matters of taste or book knowledge, etc. Hence, I believe they

operate with both groups and individuals.

If all these things above set forth be so, does it not help to make non-violent resistance seem as reasonable and sensible as war?

One interesting difference between war and non-violent resistance may here be noted. War proceeds upon the principle of "divide and rule." The superficial successes of that principle are to be seen all over the world, but they have not ended or adequately used the untold energies of hundreds of millions of people, in *every* country.

For this reason those successes are only superficial and only temporary. The suppressed energies will ultimately break out by reason of the inescapable psychological principles so clearly demonstrated by Freud and hundreds of other psychiatrists. But if the principles of "divide and rule" are believed in by one party, the only way to win a lasting victory over him is to use the contrary principle of "unite and live co-operatively" employed by non-violent resistance.

We have spoken of non-violent resistance as a new and more efficient weapon of warfare. Let us examine that idea a little further.

"The leading masters of military science all agree that the larger principles of war are unchanging but that the methods of applying these principles are liable to change. If we examine records of past campaigns, we can find numerous instances which illustrate the danger of ignoring the modifications rendered necessary in the art of war by the discovery of a new weapon on the evolution of new tactics."¹

Col. Fuller's whole book, above referred to, is built around the idea that new and highly effective weapons have recently been devised by science, such as poison gas, airplanes, tanks, etc., and that the tactics of war must be radically altered in accordance therewith.²

He argues (at pp. 28 and 29) that in war a nation should seek to impose its will on the enemy with the least possible ethical and economic loss. He points out that a nation which uses foul tactics degrades itself and loses prestige and the trust of other nations. Also that the destruction of the enemy's economic resources means the destruction of possible markets after the war is over. Hence the smaller the losses, the greater the victory. Killing is also an economic

1. A. A. Walser—*Air Power*—19th Century, April, 1923, p. 598.

2. See also his article on *The Progress of War* in *The 19th Century* for October, 1926, p. 481.

and moral loss. Killing the enemy's troops is only a means for the breaking of his will. But military minds have concentrated on this means until they have become obsessed with it. The passions of battle have enhanced the obsession until in the last war the parties nearly destroyed themselves in their effort to destroy each other. The post-war exhaustion has been so great that an effort should be made to devise a way of compelling an enemy to change his policy by bloodlessly defeating his army. He shows very forcibly that disabling and lethal gases are a tremendously powerful weapon of demoralization, and argues that they are far less destructive of life than bullets, shells and bayonets.

We would accept his logic almost throughout, except for his statistics of gas casualties on which he bases his conclusions. There is some doubt as to the accuracy of all statistics of gas casualties in the War because of the difficulty of differentiating in the field between those dying from the effects of gas alone and those killed only by bullets, shells or other weapons than gas. Also the gases in future wars will certainly be far more severe in their effects than in the past, for the military mind clings to the idea of

killing and the chemists have been working very industriously on the problem.

We would urge that the weapon that can demoralize without killing is not gas, but non-violent resistance. We have indicated the reasons for our belief that this is the most efficient means for the ultimate aim that lies behind that purpose, namely, the altering of the enemy's will and the securing of a satisfying peace.

With that one alteration in regard to the final step, Col. Fuller's book is one of the strongest and most clearly reasoned arguments in favor of non-violent resistance that we have found anywhere. And coming from a military realist who is anxious to have warfare catch up with science, including the science of psychology, it should carry weight. In this connection Marshal Foch's warning may be pertinent:—

“The military mind always imagines that the next war will be on the same lines as the last. That has never been the case, and never will be.”¹

Mr. Walter Lippman, editor of the *New York World* wrote an excellent

1. See his *Principles of War*, previously cited, at p. 203.

article in the *Atlantic Monthly*¹ for August 1928, on *The Political Equivalent of War*. After quoting from William James' essay on *A Moral Equivalent for War*, he said (p. 181)

"It is not sufficient to propose an equivalent for the military virtues. It is even more important to work out an equivalent for the military methods and objectives. For the institution of war is not merely an expression of the military spirit. It is not a mere release of certain subjective impulses clamouring for expression. It is also—and, I think, primarily—one of the ways by which great human decisions are made. If that is true, then the abolition of war depends primarily upon inventing and organizing other ways of deciding those issues which hitherto have been decided by war"

(P. 182.)

"Any real program of peace must rest on the promise that there will be causes of dispute as long as we can foresee, that these disputes have to be decided, and that a way of deciding them must be found which is not war." . . .

Such a way has been found. We have described its psychological mechanisms in Chapters II, III and IV. It has actually been put in effect on a large scale. Corporate or mass non-violent resistance has actually been practised with excellent success, although certain inadequacies of

news dissemination have not made the facts very widely known throughout the world. We will tell briefly of these instances in a subsequent chapter, but here we are merely concerned with the reasons why non-violent resistance is a new and efficient weapon of war. We have seen that it is strikingly like war in several important respects. Now let us look into the question of its efficiency.

VI

THE EFFICIENCY OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE AS A WEAPON OF WAR

HOW could non-violent resistance possibly be more effective than war?

One reason for the superior efficiency of non-violent resistance comes, as Col. Fuller suggests,¹ after we reflect upon the words inscribed under the statue of General Sherman in Washington—"The legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace." If the peace after the war is to be better than that which preceded it, must not the psychological processes of the conflict be such as will create a more perfect peace? You can't climb a mountain by constantly going down hill. Mutual violence inevitably breeds hatred, revenge and bitterness—a poor founda-

1. See his article, *The Progress of War in The 19th Century* for October 1926, at pp. 483, 492 and 493.

tion for a more perfect peace. Is it then silly to say that the method of non-violent resistance, where there really is resistance, so as to bring all the issues out into the open, and a really new settlement worked out as nearly as possible in accord with the full truth of the issues at stake—is it silly to say that this will not bring a more perfect peace? Is not non-violent resistance then more effective than violence?

The second reason for the efficiency of non-violent resistance grows out of the object of war as stated at the beginning of chapter V; namely, to demoralize the enemy, to break his will, to destroy his confidence and enthusiasm.

As Hocking points out, "Morale is, at the bottom, a state of will or purpose."¹ It seems to rest largely upon such factors as the individual soldier's confidence in himself, in his comrades, in his army, in his leaders, in the methods used, in the cause for which the war is being waged, in his government, in the civilians of the nation behind them all. It also contains such elements as a sense of being merged into the larger unity of the army, habit,

1. W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U. S. A., 1918, p. 151.

tradition, humour, an appreciation of risk and a relish for adventure.¹

Suppose a group of non-violent resisters were opposed to a company of soldiers, in a case of a strike, or some non-violent Philippinoes against United States soldiers, or Indians against British soldiers. Suppose also that the soldiers attempted some clubbing tactics or bayonet work. Let us assume also that the civilians had been non-violent from the start so that there is no shooting by the soldiers. (For the moment we will defer the case of a massacre due to the commander of the troops losing his head or using undue terrorism. That will be discussed later.) But suppose some violence by the soliders, and arrests of the civilians. Also that the cause is strong enough so that as fast as any are arrested, others come to take their places. What, presumably, would be the effect on the morale of the soldiers?

1. See Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*; F. C. Bartlett, *Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927; Lieut. Col. L. C. Andrews—*Military Man power* (Psychology of Military Training)—E. B. Dutton and Co., New York, 1920; H. G. Lord—*The Psychology of Courage*—Luce & Co., Boston, Mass., 1918; Sir Ian Hamilton—*The Soul and Body of the Army*—Edw. Arnold, London, 1921. Also an article by Bt. Lt.-Col. L. V. Bond, R. E. General Staff on *The Principles of Field Service Regulations* in the Journal of the United Service Institution of India for July, 1921, Simla, India.

To a certain extent the effect would be the same as that described in the preceding chapter where an individual person violently attacks a non-violent resister. But the discipline and habits of the soldiers would largely prevent this from happening at first. The individual soldier's will has become merged with the general will of the army, and wholly subordinated to that of the commanding officer. He is used to rough tactics and is not at all squeamish about inflicting pain and injury on others.

Nevertheless, "one of the chief results of military training is to increase the suggestibility of the private."¹ Of course, as Rivers points out, this suggestibility is chiefly in relation to the officers, but no doubt the soldiers would also be very suggestible in relation to the acts and conduct of their opponents or "enemies", because such acts and conduct are the whole object toward which the morale of the soldiers has been built up. This is also indicated by the remarks of Von Clausewitz and Von Caemmerer previously quoted in Chapter III. "War is a

1. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 219, also 211-212. During the War, Rivers was on the staff of a British hospital for treating shell shock and other nervous diseases of soldiers.

constant state of reciprocal action, the effects of which are mutual." "Every action in war is saturated with mental forces and effects... War is a constant reciprocal effect of action of both parties." This fact then would presently tend to offset a little the discipline and hardness of the soldiers.

Undoubtedly the conduct of these civilians would cause surprise in the individual soldier and thus start him thinking. Frederick, the Great, wrote, "If my soldiers began to think, not one would remain in the ranks." As soon as a soldier begins to think of certain sorts of things, he begins to be an individual, to separate himself from the mass mind, the will and personality of the army. One surgeon in the British army wrote, "The whole army training is designed for this one purpose of merging the individual into the mass."¹ If, then, the soldier is made to think for himself in the midst of a conflict, it is the opening wedge for the disintegration of his morale. I do not mean to say that modern soldiers do no thinking at all, but it will be conceded that in these days

1. T. H. Proctor—*The Motives of the Soldier*—31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26 (Oct. 1920). In accord, see Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, pp. 210, 211, 213.

of the printing press a very large proportion of all people do very little thinking for themselves. And among soldiers, this is still more true over a still wider range of affairs.

As the struggle proceeds, suppose the non-violent civilians maintain their discipline and keep cheerful but also keep stating their side of the case earnestly and in all sincerity. Sooner or later, it is going to cause the soldiers to talk about it among themselves while off duty. The total absence of retaliation or vindictiveness of even looks or tone of voice on the part of the civilians will be seen in contrast with the harsh or stern commands of their officers. The situation will tell on the nerves of both officers and soldiers. This sort of thing is new to them. They do not know just how to treat it. These civilians seem wholly inoffensive and harmless and honest. What is their crime? Why were we soldiers called out for such a job? We are for war work, but this is peace. Thus they will question in their minds and perhaps among themselves. They will begin to fraternize openly or surreptitiously with the civilians and prisoners, and learn more about the dispute or situation in which they are engaged. It will no

longer appear to be a clear-cut case of right *vs.* wrong, but the opponent's case will appear to have more elements of reason in it.

If the officers forbid them to fraternize with these people, the soldiers will tend either to think that the order is stupid or that the officers are afraid of something. This would lessen respect for their officers and lower morale.

If there really is solid truth in the position of the non-violent resisters, the soldiers will presently begin to question the validity of the cause for which they have been called out. They may become somewhat slack in obeying orders. They will see no good to be gained by their being there, and no evil or danger to be averted. "When doubt comes, morale crumbles."¹ The Duke of Wellington put it even more forcefully—"No man with any scruples of conscience is fit to be a soldier." One of the important elements in a soldier's morale is his consciousness of being a protector². If he is deprived of that, he feels useless and perhaps a little absurd. It is possible that matters

1. H. G. Lord—*The Psychology of Courage*, p. 150, above cited.

2. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies* p. 99, previously cited.

may even get to such a pass that the soldiers will feel that somehow the authorities or their officers have morally "let them down" or "sold" them. In such an event, their morale will go quickly.

Meanwhile the situation is very unpleasant for the officers, too. If they make any serious mistake, they are apt to lose the respect of the private soldiers as well as of the general public. If they order any shooting there is almost sure to be a wave of public indignation against them. They know how to fight, but they feel that this situation is "a mess." As Lt. Col. Andrews says,¹ "Officers naturally dread riot duty, with the uncertainties as to how to handle the many delicate situations." While there is no rioting here, the situation is felt to be just as delicate, nevertheless, perhaps even more so. Soldiers are trained for action. This encounter is nearly all quiet. Inaction is notoriously hard on a soldier's morale.²

But you may object that non-violent resistance is so largely defensive, so passive, that it would be fully as hard on

1. *Military Manpower*, p. 175, above cited.

2. F. C. Bartlett, *Psychology and the Soldier*, Cambridge University Press, 1927, pp. 172-175; Hocking, *Morale and its Enemies*, p. 159, previously cited.

the morale of those using it as on that of the soldiers opposing them. Not so, however. The conduct of the non-violent resister is not one of mere passive waiting or endurance. Toward his opponent he is not aggressive physically, but his mind and emotions are exceedingly active, wrestling constantly with the problem of persuading the latter that he is mistaken, seeking proposals as to a better way out, examining his own cause and organization to see what mistakes or short-sightedness there may be in them, thinking constantly of all the possible ways of winning the truth for both sides. And among his own group, he is ceaselessly active in strengthening their organization, perfecting their discipline, enlightening their understanding, helping them to remove every possible cause of reproach. He is as busy as any top sergeant of a regiment.

Most private soldiers are bored with monotony and irresponsibility. The conduct of these civilians will be new to them and will elicit their interest and attention all the more because of their previous boredom. It will be a relief and diversion to have something new to think about.

The courage and persistence of the non-violent resisters will tend to call forth the admiration of the soldiers and

onlookers or general public. All parties begin to feel that the wrong method has been chosen by the authorities. They tend to feel that this is a matter for a court or arbitration or discussion of some sort. This feeling makes rifts between privates and officers and the higher command or civilian authorities.

If the situation should drag on for several weeks, the officers will tend to get even more restive. It is undignified to have to proceed thus against harmless, decent, defenceless people. They begin to feel themselves in a ludicrous position; unfairly treated. Neither the officers nor the privates can feel that they are protecting anyone or any property.¹ That consciousness tends to lower self-respect.

Perhaps there has been a great campaign afloat to make this group of non-violent resisters seem very low in public esteem. They have perhaps been accused of bodily uncleanness, dirt, disorder, illiteracy, ignorance, bad manners, mental and moral degeneracy; they are said to be "beyond the pale," "barbarous," "beneath contempt," etc.,

I. Cf. The near mutiny of English soldiers occupying the Ruhr after the war while the starvation blockade of Germany was still in effect.

etc. We all know that method of bolstering up one's own pride and self-esteem. It is easy to find faults in a stranger, or differences that seem like faults; and a little unconscious Phariseeism helps immensely to increase one's morale and salve one's conscience. But the soldiers in immediate contact with them find that in fact they are clean, orderly, well-disciplined, determined, intelligent, "very decent" in behaviour, and very courageous. It is impossible to be disgusted, disdainful, scornful or contemptuous of such men. And when respect begins, the instinct for fair play asserts itself. And by that time, morale is not very prominent. That such things can happen even in far more unlikely circumstances is proved by the fraternizing between the German and Allied troops on the first Christmas of the Great War.

Perhaps one of the officers loses his head, or believes in "making an example" and teaching by terror, and orders the soldiers to fire on the unarmed non-violent civil resisters, and many are wounded and killed. The effect is indeed electrical. The immediate beholders may be terror-stricken for a short time. But the news will spread inevitably, and the public indignation and disgust toward the officer

and those soldiers will be absolutely overpowering. Witness the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in India. Those hundreds who died did more by their death in that manner to lower British self-respect and British prestige in every country, and to further the cause of Indian political freedom than could the deaths of thrice that number in violent rioting or attack upon the army. There have undoubtedly been similar cases of violence by American troops, French troops, troops of any and every nation which likes to consider itself a "trustee" for other nations, tribes or races. A similar case occurred in the United States in the winter of 1929, when Pennsylvania Coal Company police killed a miner on strike. Such deeds are not peculiar to any nation but only to a particular purpose and set of beliefs. The point to be emphasized, however, is that non-violent resistance, even in the extreme case where its users are killed, has a far higher probability of weakening the morale of the violent opponents and of promoting the aim sought for than violent resistance would have.

As we are trying to be realists, let us also see what might happen where the soldiers use poison gas, either of a disabling or lethal kind or bomb

attacks by airplanes. This would not be a frequent occurrence, as the previous non-violence would not be apt to incite such an act from the soldiers. But it has happened. In such an event there would temporarily cease to be direct effective contact between the soldiers and the non-violent resisters. Therefore, the morale of the soldiers would probably not be weakened. But I venture to assert that such an attack would add so many sympathizers to the ranks of the non-violent resisters from among their own people, that a very complete and effective trade boycott and "strike" of domestic or industrial work for all of the people on the side of the soldiers could and probably would be organized. The economic pressure of such boycotts needs no very direct contact to be effective. It is felt tens of thousands of miles away, in the most distant countries. Such a boycott would cause far greater losses to such violent people than any temporary advantage from their terrorism. It would make such tactics much less probable in the future. And the reduction in number of such events gives the non-violent resisters other opportunities to weaken their opponents' morale.

Inasmuch as the government of those

soldiers in question is seeking to impose its will upon the non-violent resisters, there will necessarily be parleys sooner or later between the non-violent resisters' leaders and the officers of that army or emissaries from that government. Such parleys mean contact, and contact means an opportunity to disturb morale, just as in the case of Brest-Litovsk.

Also it should be remembered that such ruthless deeds tend to become known to the world at large and then to lessen the respect of other nations for the nation indulging in them. A decrease of prestige is not relished by any nation nowadays. The Government in question, besides receiving foreign censure, will be severely criticised by its own more decent citizens. They may create very considerable pressure of public opinion against the government and compel it to alter its tactics. It is true that distant civilians who have been blinded by their own pride and long-continued propaganda are very often harder to touch than the hostile soldiers on the spot. The arm-chair warriors at home during the Great War were unbelievably cruel and hard, and worse in America than in England or France because they were farther away and felt realities less. Yet

once their morale gets a little undermined, they crumble rapidly, for they have not been subjected to the discipline of soldiers.

The experienced person will say that such events are always hidden by the censorship of such a government. Sometimes this is so. Acts of the American marines in Haiti and Nicaragua were hidden that way for months. The news of Jallianwala Bagh did not reach the United States for eight months after the event. But the tendency is for them to leak out sooner or later. People of all nationalities go to all parts of the world nowadays. Travel and trade are ubiquitous. Newspaper reporters are always keen for scenting a "story," and as soon as they learn of a censorship anywhere they are still more eager. The modern press services have long stimulated people's curiosity. And if curiosity finds itself balked or thwarted, it will never rest till the story is known. And Western nations are all so jealous of one another that each is eager to learn and publish something discreditable to the others. (I am not trying to criticise, but merely to state facts -- weaknesses among those who are addicted to violence, will effective-

ly operate.) Any considerable struggle in which one side rigidly sticks to non-violent resistance with any degree of success makes wonderful news. It is so unusual and dramatic. Newspaper reporters and correspondents have a sense of "news value," and can be trusted to try hard to evade government censorship.

Of course powerful ruling groups and countries rely chiefly on pride, disdain and disgust to censor the news. They or their supporters vilify these protesting groups or nations, and the general repugnance thereby created acts as a screen against the truth. Shand, whom we cited at the beginning of Chap. II, says (p. 448):

"Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt tend to arrest and detain attention on the things which excite them only so long as may be necessary to avoid them. Repugnance, Disgust and Contempt tend to exclude wonder in relation to their objects. . . . (p. 378). Disgust tends to exclude curiosity about its object and all further knowledge of it. . . . Disgust tends to repress pity and all disinterested sorrow on behalf of its object."

Many a trade unionist knows the truth of this out of his own hard experience. So also do the Negroes, Chinese and Indians, poor immigrants in the United States, and many others. Intelligent people all over the world should be

very much on their guard when they see any disdainful or vilifying newspaper stories, articles or books about any group or nation other than their own, or any statements making subtle invidious comparisons of other people with themselves. Beware of self-flattery! Whether or not such articles or books or accounts were written or told intentionally or innocently, the result is to hide the more important facts and truths in the situation. I do not mean that one should not see all aspects of every situation fully and clearly, merely remember that adverse criticism is dangerous to the person who uses it or absorbs it.

But any repressed or oppressed groups anywhere may also be sure that sincere non-violent resistance on their own part will surely break down such barriers and rouse curiosity, respect and wonder enough to bring forth enough of the truth to bring about a far more satisfactory adjustment of the conflict.

In Col. Fuller's book previously cited we find this statement at p. 70:—

“Chivalry, in the broadest sense of the word, is the cultivation of respect in an enemy for or by his opponent. . . . The side which, in war, first attains a superiority in chivalry is the side which attains a spiritual victory over its enemy, a victory which

normally not only precedes a material success but which wins the ethical objective of war, which is the true foundation of the peace which follows it."

And at p. 64:—

"As the military object of war is to defeat the enemy, and as the economic object is to add to the prosperity of the nation, so is the ethical object to enhance the national character, that is, to increase its respect in the eyes not only of the enemy but of neutral nations. A man who fights cleanly is always applauded even if he lose; consequently, under certain circumstances, it is even more important to win the ethical objective than the military one; these circumstances depending almost entirely on the mentality of the combatants."

But the non-violent resisters must realize that they cannot lower the prestige of their opponents or create dissension among their opponents' supporters until they break through the censorship of governments, press associations, or disdain; that they cannot break through these censorships until they have conducted themselves with high excellence, cleanness and courage so as to compel respect, admiration and wonder. Therefore their chief efforts should be not in talking to reporters or appealing for help from outsiders, but with themselves, to increase their own discipline and organization, their courage and courtesy and intelligence and cleanness and order.

They should strive for such details even as clean bodies, clean clothes, clean houses, clean streets, clean talk. Military discipline is thorough and detailed like this. Non-violent discipline must be the same. For these reasons there is need for the utmost energy and determination and persistence and will-power on the part of non-violent resisters, whether they be national groups or labor unions or what not. It is chiefly directed toward themselves and hence will not arouse outside opposition. They will compel respect when they deserve it and not before. And when they can compel respect, they are on the road to upsetting their opponents' morale.

One more policy of ruthlessness must be considered, namely, that of starvation. This was used against the Germans with fearful effect during the war. But it is a weapon that cuts both ways. It not only weakened the Germans greatly during the war, but so interfered with their recuperative ability after the "peace" that it reduced the prosperity of the whole world. The allied bankers and merchants are still suffering from the German loss of purchasing power. Even the militarists are beginning to realize this.¹

1. See Col. Fuller's book, above cited, at p. 95.

The great naval nations will hesitate before they try that weapon against a whole nation.

Against smaller groups they might attempt starvation, but if such groups are really in earnest, have a good cause, and maintain good discipline, their resistance will surely affect public opinion and lower the morale of their opponents. Compare, for instance, the effect of MacSwinney's hunger strike in prison during the Irish struggle for freedom.

Of course, certain forms of economic pressure, such as low wages, adverse tariffs, and various discriminatory trading and other practices, may amount to slow starvation. We are confining ourselves in this chapter to the relatively rapid processes and openly avowed practices of war or open conflict. The more gradual impoverishment will be discussed in a later chapter on the economic aspects of non-violent resistance.

Any persons who feel aggrieved by the policies of the ruling groups of either the British Empire or the United States may count on help from one further element in the situation. It lies in the strong desire of the peoples of those countries always to justify their conduct morally, to give it at least a moral tone or

appearance.¹ This was well shown by the extent to which the invasion of Belgium by the Germans in 1914 was used by Britain and the Allies to stiffen their own morale and secure help from neutrals. It enabled them to play the part of chivalrous defenders of the weak.² It served to cover up many mistakes, faults and evils of the Allies, and kept them all feeling splendidly self-righteous for several years, at least till the secret treaties leaked out. Most people want to appear highly moral, especially all with the Anglo-Saxon cast of mind. The political effect of this attitude of mind is a desire for and reliance upon what is known as prestige—a superiority-complex which is designed to create an inferiority-complex among other races or nations, and thus make the task of dominating somewhat easier.

The maintenance of this prestige requires respect or awe or fear from others. Now if any of these Anglo-Saxon governments or ruling groups engage in harsh violence against a group of truly non-violent resisters, the news will surely leak out sooner or later and

1. See *Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards*, an *Essay in Comparative Psychology* by Salvador de Madariaga, pp. 27 and 58. Oxford University Press, London, 1928.

2. Cf. *The Motive of the Soldier* by T. H. Proctor, 31 Int. J. of Ethics 26, at p. 34, Oct. 1920.

considerably lessen the prestige of that ruling group in the eyes of the rest of the world. Also in the eyes of the more honest and intelligent persons among the nation in question. The highly moral attitude and tone of the professions of that government begin to look a little thin and ludicrous. Dignity and prestige are very difficult to preserve against a background of such inconsistencies. This is equivalent to a weakening of the morale of that governing group. After all, public opinion all over the world condemns ruthless violence and cruelty as such, once the cloak of disgust, disdain or fear propaganda has been removed. We are no longer living in the days of Jenghis Khan or Attila or Nebuchadnezzar. The way in which the world responded to the German attack on Belgium proves this, wholly aside from any question as to the Allies' sincerity in playing on the appeal. Thus the need of those who rely on prestige, for respect from the rest of the world, becomes a weak spot in their armor, a heel of Achilles, the minute that they do an act which does not deserve or actually win respect. The non-violent resister's weapon of love of truth is directed immediately at this weak spot and pushed home with all courage and fortitude.

We saw that Von Clausewitz considers that one of the three principal objects in carrying on war is to gain public opinion. For securing this end non-violent resistance is a far more effective means than war or violence. Victories in war are imposing and terrifying, but the alliances and co-operations gained thereby are notoriously unstable. Such allies come more because it seems expedient than because they really want to. A victory by non-violent resistance does not carry with it a further latent threat to harm any one. It carries conviction of sincerity and friendship, whereas a victory through violence always has in it at least a suspicion of selfishness and possible further aggrandizement. In quality a victory by non-violent resistance is far more gallant and joyous than one of violence can ever be. It requires no lying or distortion or suppression of the truth, no slaughter or threats. It leaves no bad conscience or bad taste in the mouth. The public opinion it gains is weighty and lasting, because based on truth.

It is quite possible that to some readers this whole chapter will seem to be built up upon a structure of theory and false assumptions. Who in this actual

world of hard realities does, or ever would, for an instant fear this so-called weapon of non-violent resistance?

The answer is known by every candid student of history, every detective, secret-service man or C.I.D. officer, every really "hard-boiled" ruthless executive of an American industrial corporation which has had a strike of employees, every American trade union leader, every leader of a subject people striving for political freedom. (I refer to Americans because they are rather violent, perhaps a result of their climate, their poly-national make-up and relatively short experience in living together as a nation.) The answer is that every "blood-and-iron" type of governor fears non-violent resistance so much that he secretly hires so-called *agents provocateurs* who go among the non-violent resisters and present to be one of them, and invite them to deeds of violence or actually throw bombs or do deeds of violence themselves.¹ This was the method of the old Russian government under Tsardom. The rulers in power immediately make great outcry, stir up public indignation against the "miscreants," call out the police or

I. See Robert Hunter—*Violence and the Labor Movement*, pp. 110-120—Macmillan, New York, 1914.

soldiery, and "repress the uprising" with considerable brutality, meanwhile assuring the world that these are stern but necessary steps taken only in the interests of public safety, law and order. I do not for a moment deny that those striving for freedom or more privileges are not violent in the first instance. But if they are not violent, their opponents or the underlings of their opponents frequently stir up violence in order to take advantage of the public reaction against it. That they feel they need to adopt such tactics shows how much they fear non-violent resistance.

Non-violent resisters must face this fact without anger or bitterness. It is simply one item in the whole situation with which they have to contend. Their defense against it is to build up a thorough discipline of non-violence in thought, word and deed amongst every one of their members. They must see the whole meaning of what they are trying to do. They are trying to discipline and control the emotion of anger and the instinct of pugnacity in the same way and to the same extent that military discipline controls the emotion of fear and the instinct of flight. Therefore under this new discipline, violent words and actions directed

against the opponent or his interests are to be made as traitorous to the cause as running away is in the army. Anger is to become as disgraceful and socially reprehensible as cowardice is now among schoolboys or soldiers.

Once that understanding and attitude and discipline are attained among the group of non-violent resisters, any *agent provocateur* who comes whispering among them or talking in their councils in favor of violence, retaliation or revenge will be immediately known for what he is, and ushered out. And the group will soon prove its tactics so clearly to the public that the latter will not be deceived by the act of an *agent provocateur*, bomb thrower or inflammatory speaker.

But is not human nature too weak for this discipline? Is it not impossible? No, not under proper training. It may take a few years to establish. It is said to take four years to make a good private soldier. New habits take time to become firm. "One lesson of the war is that discipline is effective in making good soldiers out of the most unpromising material." ¹ This is as true of the control or discipline of anger as it is of the disci-

1. *The Motives of the Soldier*, by T. H. Proctor, 31 International Journal of Ethics 26, at p. 36. (Oct. 1920)

pline of fear. It is proved by the success in 1928 with the perfectly ordinary human material among the peasantry of Bardoli district, whereby, as a result of several years of training, they conducted a wholly successful non-violent struggle against the government of Bombay Presidency (India) for a revision of the method of assessing land taxes. Those few thousand simple and largely illiterate peasants won their fight on practically all the items of their original demands. A victory like this against the cleverest and most experienced ruling class in the world, is no small test of the efficacy of the method. More examples will be cited in a later chapter.

Napolean said that the value of discipline is 75 per cent of all the elements that go to make success in battle.¹ Foch wrote, "Discipline constitutes the main strength of armies."² The Duke of Wellington said, "Nature! Habit is ten times nature."³ This is just as true of the non-violent discipline as of the discipline in violence. Gandhi realized

1. Lt.-Col. S. C. Andrews, *Military Manpower*, p. 17, cited above.

2. Foch, *Principles of War*, p. 99, above cited.

3. Cf. William James' chapter on Habit, in his *Principles of Psychology*.

this when he called off the struggle for Indian political independence in 1922 after the Chauri-Chaura riots. He was sure that non-violent resistance was the only way by which India could gain her political freedom. He tried to teach and train India to use that weapon. But when many did not understand the new method or failed in their self-control so that there were riots in Bombay in November, 1921, and again in Chauri-Chaura in early 1922, he saw that they were not sufficiently disciplined. He could no more wage his kind of war with the people so undisciplined than Napoleon or Foch could win *their* kind without discipline. Therefore, he very wisely declined battle. But that did not mean that the *method* was a failure, but only that the new discipline was not sufficiently understood nor the training sufficiently prolonged. His hostile Indian critics in this matter did not understand the new method. Some of his formal enemies understood him better and appraised the power of his weapon more truly.

Sir George Lloyd, at that time Governor of Bombay Presidency, in an interview with Mr. Drew Pearson, is reported to have said:—¹

1. Quoted from article by C. F. Andrews—*The*

"He gave us a scare! His program filled our jails. You can't go on arresting people for ever, you know—not when there are 319,000,000 of them. And if they had taken his next step, and refused to pay taxes! God knows where we would have been.

"Gandhi's was the most colossal experiment in world history; and it came within an inch of succeeding. But he couldn't control men's passions. They become violent; and he called off his program."

The failure at that time through lack of discipline no more proves that non-violent resistance is ineffective or futile or impossible than the many routs and flights in battle prove that armies and violence are ineffective and absurd. Nor do the deaths and sufferings of non-violent resisters in the past prove any more in this respect than the deaths and wounds of war. This was the first attempt to organize and discipline a large army of non-violent resisters. Is it surprising that there was enough undiscipline and mis-understanding to make it necessary to call a halt, execute a strategic retreat and begin to reform the ranks and train them more intensively and fundamentally?

As a matter of fact there was pro-

Coming Crisis in India,—in *The New Republic*, New York, April 3, 1929.

portionately more misunderstanding and lack of discipline among the literate and "intelligencia" of India than among the illiterate peasantry. This is natural, because absorption of Western ways of thinking was an influence in favour of Western ways. Mental habit is strong, and so it was not easy for the "intelligencia" to understand this new concept and discipline. This largely accounts also for the misunderstanding of Mr. Gandhi in the West. In reality he is one of the greatest strategists and statesmen of all history,

Up till now, pacifists (the term is a misnomer) have not sufficiently realized either the possibilities of joint, corporate action in non-violent resistance, nor the necessity for discipline, nor the kind and intensity and many-sided details of that discipline.¹ They should learn from their friends, the militarists.

Bertrand Russell quite truly said :²

"Passive resistance, if it were adopted deliberately by the will of the whole nation, with the same

1. Cf. Ernest Toller—*Man and the Masses* (Masse-mensch), Trans. by L. Untermeyer,—Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, 1924.

2. B. Russell—*War and Non-Resistance*—116 Atlantic Monthly 266 (Aug. 1915).—Boston, U. S. A. Reprinted in his book, *Justice in War Time*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1924.

measure of courage and discipline which is now displayed, might achieve a far more perfect protection for what is good in national life than armies and navies can ever achieve, without demanding the carnage and waste and welter of brutality involved in modern war."

He goes on in the same article to show how it would work if, for instance, England were invaded by a German army of conquest, and Englishmen used non-violent resistance.

The failures and apparent futilities of non-violent resistance in the past have been due, I believe, very largely to lack of discipline, as well as lack of understanding of the full implications and requirements of the method. Of course, there are sure to be some casualties and losses under it, even at its best. But provided there is discipline and intelligent leadership which fully understands the psychological mechanisms and the moral and spiritual elements involved, I am convinced that the losses will be much less than in violent war. The calculus of moral probabilities gives this answer, and historical examples of its intelligent practice proves it, as will appear in a subsequent chapter. Even in the case of individual encounters, if the method is used with understanding or faith, and

complete sincerity, the chances of failure or death are less, I believe, than if violence is relied upon. And of course, even where death occurs, the cause for which the man died may triumph in spite of or even because of his death. The validity of the method is to be tested mainly by its ability to achieve success for the causes in which it is used, but also partly by its ability to achieve such results with less destruction of life, physical injury or destruction of property than when violence is used. On both these points non-violent resistance wins, provided the discipline, understanding and leadership are sound. And all these are as possible as in the case of military methods.

Everyone knows that an army can be very effective without every soldier in it, or even a majority of them, being individual paragons of intelligence and military virtue. Discipline removes most of the effect of their individual weaknesses and adds momentum to their virtues. It is the same with a group or army of disciplined non-violent resisters. If their leaders have the requisite attitude, understanding and intelligence, the rank and file may be ordinary human material at the start. Of course, the new training and discipline will improve them enormously, but that effect is also asserted for military

discipline. Presumably, the smaller the group, the more complete the discipline and understanding must be. Individuals using non-violent resistance alone would require more self-control and ability to do it successfully than is needed for a disciplined group. But even here the inner attitude and emotional understanding and control are much more important than any intellectual ability or experience in the rough-and-tumble world. Indeed, in certain situations so called "intellect" and experience count for almost nothing.

Hence it does not appear necessary that every single person in a nation seeking freedom by non-violent resistance must be fully disciplined to non-violence, any more than every single citizen in a nation at war must be fully disciplined for active battle and wholly fearless under attack. Yet it is just as possible for whole nations to *understand* the idea and to be so self-disciplined as to give the "troops" hearty support and do nothing (as by outbreaks of anger and violence, riots, etc.) to interfere with their operations, as it is in the case of whole nations understanding war and supporting their armies in time of war.

"But," says the shrewd critic, "even if we grant the efficiency of this new

weapon provided it could once get under way, would it not quickly be rendered impossible by merely imprisoning or deporting for life the few leaders who understand it and see its possibilities?" The answer is, No. The idea has already gone too far. New leaders would spring up as fast as you arrest the old ones. Nowadays you can't arrest quiet, steady, industrious, gentle people for nothing. Non-violence is decency to the nth power. Governments, after all, have to make some appearance of existing for the welfare of their peoples. Wholesale arrests for the practice of virtue can't continue very long. The examples of those few leaders is so striking that their execution or life imprisonment would be dangerous to governments. Governmental prestige both at home and abroad would suffer too heavily. The discipline of non-violent resistance begins at home and can be acquired in simple daily living. It requires no marching or external drilling or carrying of arms. Therefore, once the idea gets understood, the governments, captains of industry, and strong powers of the world will have to begin to make good their professions and assertions that they exist for the benefit of the governed, or are the servants of their people.

Nor need the governors be fearful. Non-violent resistance will break down very quickly if the cause of its adherents is not sound. In order to be successful it *must* be true. It tests the sincerity of both its users and their opponents. No governor will be willing openly to oppose the truth; and if he is intelligent he will want to get it on his side or get on its side as quickly and smoothly as possible. The governors will sleep much more restfully if they become more virtuous and open-minded and willing to learn than many of them are now. The discipline and good order developed and required for the successful practice of non-violent resistance creates the finest citizenry imaginable. It evokes trust from all sides. *Everybody* will be much more secure and happy, the governors included. They will discover unexpected delights and unlooked for prosperities for themselves as soon as they have shared their privileges a little more widely and thus unlocked the pent-up energies of mankind—the means of all wealth.

We can now see that non-violent resistance “reduces the utility of armaments as instruments of policy,” to use de Madariaga’s phrase.¹ It does so partly

1. Salvador de Madariaga, *Disarmament*, p. 60

in direct and positive manner, proposing and aiding in the creation of 'new' terms of settlement, new roads out of conflict. It also does so by disintegrating the morale of the opponents, the morale of troops, of commanders, of civil authorities and of their home civilian populations. It acts like the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk to raise opposition at home to the policy of the opposing government. In case of industrial strikes, it would tend to raise doubts in the minds of stockholders of the corporation involved. It tends to lower the prestige of any controlling power or group who are not acting as absolutely sensitive and true servants of the peoples within their governance.

Col. Fuller in his book heretofore quoted ¹ says at p. 46,

“ The principle of demoralization has for its object the destruction of this morale : first, in the moral attack against the spirit and nerves of the enemy's nation and government ; secondly, against this nation's policy ; thirdly, against the plan of its commander-in-chief ; and fourthly, against the morale of the soldiers commanded by him. Hitherto, the fourth, the least important of these

Oxford University Press, London, 1929 ; Coward-McCann, Inc., New York.

1. *The Reformation of War*, by Col. J. F. C. Fuller. D. S. O., Hutchinson & Co., London, 1923.

objections, has been considered by the traditionally-minded soldier as the sole psychological objective of this great principle. In the last Great War the result of this was.....that the attack on the remaining three only slowly evolved during days of stress and because of a faulty appreciation of this principle during peace-time."

Non-violent resistance does operate to lower all these different kinds of morale, and it may be effectively aided by economic boycotts or in some extreme instances, perhaps, by non-payment of taxes. The object is not to "deliver a moral blow," but to help change and even re-create the attitude and desires of the opponents, to lead them to see their aims in a broader aspect, to seek adjustments that will release and utilize harmoniously the energies of both parties. If the opponents are unusually obstinate and short-sighted, economic non-co-operation will usually help to stimulate their thought to good ends.

We see, therefore, that non-violent resistance is not wholly unlike the ideas for which Col. Fuller is contending, and which many nations today seem to be following. It is merely a step further in the logic, and in military history.

It is a characteristic of war that whenever a new weapon of attack is

invented, an effective means of defense is soon found. This is true also in the case of the new weapon of non-violent resistance. The defense against it is for the opponent to correct his mistakes and to learn a sounder way to satisfy his desires and needs. By so doing he removes both the cause of that particular conflict and that particular weakness in his own armor, and will probably not be subject to "attack" on that same point again. And curiously, this very effective defense does not cause chagrin in his former opponent, the non-violent resister, for they have become friends or at least better acquaintances, and one man's gain in that instance is not the other man's loss.

In cases where Asiatics have tried to relieve themselves of the economic and military pressure of European domination they have complained that the West cannot understand any language but that of force. If that is true, it means that the West will be utterly unprepared and helpless in the face of well-disciplined, thoroughly organised and wisely led non-violent resistance, especially if it is accompanied by an equally thorough economic boycott. The strategic principle of surprise would operate most

dramatically and effectively. To use non-violent resistance against the West would be complying with Napoleon's Sixteenth Maxim of War quoted above. But I am inclined to think that the West will come to understand the new language fairly soon, once it is shown to be strong language. The above quotation from Sir George Lloyd seems to indicate a partial understanding of the new language, and considerable worry to boot. The West is in this respect something like a baby who begins to understand what words mean before he can say any of them himself. And there can be no doubt that the West understands the language of economic boycott and decreasing profits reasonably well. No doubt the West is reluctant to alter its ways, but that is a different matter. To the extent that the West does come to understand the new language more deeply, its advance will make settlements and readjustments quicker and easier.

In summary, we see that non-violent resistance resembles war:—

(1) in having a psychological and moral aim and effect,

(2) in principles of strategy,

(3) in a discipline of a parallel emotion and instinct,

(4) as a method of settling great disputes and conflicts,

(5) in operating against the morale of the opponents,

(6) in requiring courage, dynamic energy, capacity to endure fatigue and suffering, self-sacrifice, self-control, chivalry, action,

(7) in being positive and powerful,

(8) in affording opportunity of service for a large idea, and for glory.

May we not then fairly describe it as a new and better weapon of war?

It is realistic in that it does not eliminate or attempt to eliminate possibilities of conflict and differences of interest, and includes *all* factors in the situation both material and imponderable, physical and psychological.

It does not avoid hardships, suffering, wounds or even death. In using it men and women may still risk their lives and fortunes and sacrifice all. Nevertheless, the possibilities of casualties and death are greatly reduced under it, and they are all voluntarily suffered and not imposed by the non-violent resisters.

It does not require any nation to surrender any part of its real sovereignty

or right of decision, as a league of nations would.

It does not surrender the right of self-defense, although it radically alters the nature of the defense.

It requires no expensive weapons or armament, no drill grounds or secrecy.

Considering the completeness of its effects, it is as quick and probably quicker than war by violence.

It is a weapon that can be used equally well by small or large nations, small or large groups, by the apparently weak and by the apparently strong, and even by individuals.

It compels both sides and neutrals, to seek the truth, whereas war blinds both sides and neutrals to the truth.

It is for each person to do and practice at home, abroad and in every situation of life. It is not something that can be done only by a government or by a large wealthy organization. The responsibility and the opportunity to practice it and acquire the discipline is here and now for every individual person, from childhood up.

It may be practiced by any and all races, nations, tribes, groups, classes or castes, young and old, rich and poor, men and women.

Inasmuch as some of the elements involved are essentially the same as trust, they have the same energizing effect as financial credit, only more so. Thus it stimulates and mobilizes, during the conflict and for a long time thereafter, all the idealism and energy of all groups and parties.

It does not truly impoverish either its users or their opponents.

It is much superior to William James' suggestion for a "moral equivalent for war," in that it does not require State organization, direction or assistance, it is not used against the exterior forces and conditions of Nature but against human wrongs and evils. It is therefore much more dramatic and interesting and alluring, both for young men and old, and women, too. It has even more possibilities of high daring, adventure, risk, bravery, endurance, and truly fine and noble romance than any of the chivalrous violent fighting of by-gone ages.

May we not, therefore, say of it the words which Marshal Foch used in reference to a different occasion:—"The new kind of war has begun, the hearts of soldiers have become a new weapon." ¹

1. *Principles of War*, p. 32.

VII

SOME MODERN EXAMPLES OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

THERE have been a great many instances of successful use of non-violent resistance in different countries and at different times. As the taste of historians runs more in favor of politics and wars, these other events have received but slight attention at their hands, and the records of many of them have been lost. In some instances, the non-violent resistance was by individuals; and in other instances, it took a mass or corporate form. We will only attempt to tell of a few outstanding modern examples of the latter sort, giving references to books in which cases of both kinds are described.

The first one to be considered occurred in Hungary during the middle nineteenth century.¹ The Emperor Franz

1. This is based on and largely quoted from accounts by A. Fenner Brockway in his *Non-co-operation in other*

Josef was trying to subordinate Hungary to the Austrian power, contrary to the terms of the old treaty of union of those two countries. The Hungarian moderates felt helpless, as they were too weak to fight. But Francis Deak, a Catholic landowner of Hungary, protested to them—"Your laws are violated, yet your mouths remain closed! Woe to the nation which raises no protest when its rights are outraged! It contributes to its own slavery by its silence. The nation which submits to injustice and oppression without protest is doomed."

Deak proceeded to organize a scheme for independent Hungarian education, agriculture and industry, a refusal to recognize the Austrian Government in any way, and a boycott against Austrian goods. He admonished the people not to be betrayed into acts of violence, nor to abandon the ground of legality. "This is the safe ground," he said, "on which, unarmed ourselves, we can hold our own against armed force. If suffering must be necessary, suffer with dignity." This advice was obeyed all through Hungary.

When the Austrian tax collector

lands—Tagore & Co., Madras, India, and his essay, 'Does Non-co-operation Work?' in *Pacifism in the Modern World*—Ed. By D. Allen, Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1929.

came, the people did not beat him or even hoot him—they merely declined to pay. The Austrian police then seized their goods, but no Hungarian Auctioneer would sell them. When an Austrian Auctioneer was brought, he found that he would have to bring bidders from Austria to buy the goods. The Government soon found that it was costing more to distrain the goods than the tax was worth.

The Austrians attempted to billet their soldiers upon the Hungarians. The Hungarians did not actively resist the order; but the Austrian soldiers themselves protested strongly against it, after trying to live in houses where every one despised them. The Austrian Government declared the boycott of Austrian goods illegal, but the Hungarians defied the decree. The jails were filled to overflowing. No representatives from Hungary would sit in the Imperial Parliament.

The Austrians then attempted a policy of conciliation. The prisoners were released and partial self-government given. But Hungary insisted upon its full claims. In reply, Emperor Franz Josef decreed compulsory military service. The Hungarians answered that they would refuse to obey it. Finally, on February 18, 1867,

the Emperor capitulated and gave Hungary her constitution.

This campaign seems to have been defective because of some violence of inner attitude on the part of the Hungarians. But even so, the campaign was a remarkable example of the power of non-violent resistance, even though the principle was imperfectly realized and applied.

The next example occurred in South Africa. It lasted eight years, beginning in 1906. For many years previously, Indians had been coming to Natal and the Transvaal as manual workers in the mines and elsewhere, originally at the invitation of the Europeans who wished to develop the country. Many thousands of the Indians came as indentured laborers, whose term of service was five years. They were very industrious, entered into farming and trade and thereby began to compete with the Europeans. They were subject to heavy taxes and many unfair laws. In 1906, the Government of the Union of South Africa introduced a bill in the legislature which would require every Indian to be registered by finger print, like criminals; to produce his certificate of registration upon demand of any police officer at any time. Failure to register meant deportation, and refusal to

produce the certificate would be punished by fine.

The Indians had always been subject to severe restrictions, but this proposal meant their complete subjection and probably their destruction as a community. They numbered about 150,000. Under the leadership of an Indian lawyer, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, they held meetings of protest and asked for hearings on the bill. But the government ruthlessly passed the bill. Thereupon the leading Indians, at a huge mass meeting, took an oath that they would all refuse to register and would go to jail rather than obey the law which, by its terms, they regarded as an attack upon the very foundations of their religion, their national honor, their racial self-respect, and their manhood.

They stuck to their resolve, and Mr. Gandhi and many others went to jail. The Prime Minister, General Smuts, then undertook to have the law repealed if the Indians would register voluntarily. The Indians agreed and did their part, but General Smuts did not carry out his part of the agreement. Not only that, but the government introduced a further bill which applied the old registration law to all Asiatics who had not voluntarily

registered. The Indians then resolved to renew the struggle.

Just at that time, a European Judge there made a Court decision which invalidated all Hindu and Mohammedan marriages, and thus rendered all the Indian children illegitimate and incapable of inheriting property. This roused all the Indian women. A group of them at Mr. Gandhi's suggestion, crossed from the Transvaal to Natal, an act forbidden to them by law, and picketed the Natal mines which were worked by Indian laborers. The women were imprisoned. But the men, numbering about five thousand, all came out on strike as a protest against this court decision about marriages and against a very heavy and oppressive head-tax which practically kept them in slavery. Under Mr. Gandhi's leadership, they started a march on foot across the border into the Transvaal, by way of a non-violent protest and demonstration of their refusal to be so discriminated against. It was against the law for Indians to cross the boundary line without permission.

Mr. Gandhi notified the government of this proposal and asked for a revocation of the law, several days before the

march, and again just before it started, but to no effect.

They marched, some two thousand strong, about twenty-five miles a day, living on the charity of Indian merchants. During the march, Mr. Gandhi was arrested three times, released on bail twice, and finally put in jail. The border was crossed and the army continued, leaderless, but still non-violent. Finally they were all arrested and taken back by train to Natal. They had accomplished their object, namely, to be put in jail and to make an effective protest.

They were impounded at the mines and beaten and ill-treated. Some were shot. But still they remained firm and non-violent. All this brutality aroused a tremendous storm of public opinion both in South Africa and India. Lord Hardinge, the Viceroy of India, in a public speech at Madras, praised and defended the conduct of the non-violent resisters and protested against the acts of the Union of South Africa. He then sent an English representative to negotiate with the Government of the South African Union. Two other Englishmen, Messrs. Andrews and Pearson, went from India at the request of the Indian public.

General Smuts saw he must retreat,

so he appointed a committee of investigation to save the face of the government. He also released Mr. Gandhi and two other leaders of the Indians. The Indians requested Indian representation on the committee of inquiry as surety of good faith. General Smuts refused; so Mr. Gandhi prepared to renew the struggle.

Just then a strike broke out among the European Railwaymen in South Africa. Mr. Gandhi saw that the Government was in a very difficult situation, but instead of taking advantage of the incident, he chivalrously suspended the Indian struggle until the railway strike should be over. This act won much admiration for the Indians.

After the railway strike was over, General Smuts found it necessary to yield, and the Indians won all the major parts of their demands, namely, the abolition of the registration, the abolition of the three pound head-tax, the validation of their marriages, the right of entry of educated Indians, and an assurance of just administration of existing laws. Thus the whole struggle was won by non-violent resistance.¹

1. For further details see M. K. Gandhi—*Satyagraha in South Africa*—S. Ganesan, Madras, 1928; *Mahatma*

Another case in which the principle was used was for the relief of the indigo peasant farmers of Champaran, a district of Bihar, in northern India, in 1917. This was also directed by Mr. Gandhi who had returned to live in India in 1914. He was invited to investigate the conditions of the workers on the indigo plantations and the treatment given them by their employers. The peasants were compelled by law to plant three twentieths of all their land to indigo and also were subject to other oppressive exactions by the planters.

Mr. Gandhi began his inquiry without publicity but the planters much resented his activities there and persuaded the District Magistrate that the presence of Mr. Gandhi was dangerous to the peace of the district. The Magistrate served an order upon Mr. Gandhi to leave the district by the next available train. Mr. Gandhi courteously but firmly replied that he had come there out of a sense of duty, that nothing was being done except carefully and quietly

Gandhi—Life, Writings and Speeches—Ganesh, Madras; *Speeches and Writings of M.K. Gandhi*—Natesan, Madras; *M. K. Gandhi* by J. J. Doke, Natesan, Madras; *M. K. Gandhi—My Experiments with Truth*, Vols. I, and II Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, India. Also a forthcoming *Life of Gandhi* by C. F. Andrews—Allen & Unwin, London and Macmillan, New York.

to ascertain facts, and that he would stay and, if necessary, submit to the penalty for disobedience. At the subsequent trial he simply pleaded guilty, and stated that he was faced with a conflict of duty—whether to obey the law or his conscience and the humane purposes for which he had come; and that under the circumstances he could only throw the responsibility of removing him upon the administration. The Magistrate postponed judgment, and before it was rendered, the Lieut. Governor gave orders that Mr. Gandhi should be permitted to proceed with the investigation. Then the Governor of the province interested himself in the case and, after conferring with Mr. Gandhi, he appointed a government commission of inquiry with Mr. Gandhi as a member. The commission reported unanimously that the law was unfair and the exactions of the big planters unjust. The law was repealed and justice given to the peasants. All this was wholly non-violent.¹ In purpose, the struggle was purely for economic justice, with no political implications.

I. See *My Experiments with Truth*, above cited, Vol. II; the two lives of Gandhi published by Natesan and Ganesh of Madras, above cited; also Rajendra Prasad—*Satyagraha in Champaran*—Ganesan, Madras, 1929.

Another non-violent struggle, this time for social rights, took place in a village called Vykom, in the state of Travancore in Southern India. It was also engineered by Mr. Gandhi, through some of his followers. A highway ran through the low-lying country around Vykom and through the village and close by the Brahmin quarters and a temple. For centuries, the Brahmins had refused to permit any low-caste "untouchable" people to use this road. The followers of Mr. Gandhi decided that this inhuman custom must be ended, and the road thrown open to all human beings alike. Mr. Gandhi was ill, many hundred miles away, but the young leaders came north and consulted with him on the plan of campaign, and as it proceeded he instructed them by letters and telegrams from his sick bed. Later he visited Vykom personally.

The leaders started the struggle by taking several of the "untouchable" friends with them along this road and into the Brahmin quarters. They were immediately beaten by the Brahmins, and one was seriously hurt. But the young reformers offered no violence in return. Then the police arrested several of these young followers of Mr. Gandhi for encouraging

trespass. They were condemned to prison for different periods of time, up to one year. At once, volunteers came pouring in from all parts of the country to take the place of those who were arrested. The State then forbade any further arrests but ordered the police to prevent any more of the reformers from entering the road. The police made a cordon across the road. Thereupon, by instructions from Mr. Gandhi, the reformers stood opposite the police barrier in an attitude of prayer. They organized themselves into shifts, taking turns in standing there for six hours at a time. They built a hut near by, undertook their duties on a religious basis and did hand spinning while not on active duty. At no time, did they offer any violence.

This program continued for months. Mr. Gandhi told them it must continue indefinitely until the hearts of the Brahmins should be melted. Finally the rainy season came and the road, being on low ground, was flooded.

Still the volunteers continued to stand, at times up their shoulders in water, while the police kept the cordon in small boats. The shifts had to be shortened to three hours. The volunteers underwent immense suffering.

Of course, all this time there was a furore of discussion of the matter all over India. The brave endurance and the consistent non-violence of the reformers was finally too much for the obstinacy of the Brahmins. In the autumn of 1925 after a year and four months, they broke down saying, "We cannot any longer resist the prayers that have been made to us, and we are ready to receive the 'untouchables.'" The Brahmins opened the road to all comers, and the low caste people were allowed to walk at any time past the temple and past the Brahmin quarters.

Of course, this change of policy had reverberations all through India and aided greatly in removing similar restrictions against the 'untouchables' in other parts of India, and in immensely strengthening the cause of caste reform.

Still another successful non-violent struggle for economic justice took place in 1921 up in the Himalayas, in a little district called Kotgarh, north of Simla, with a population of only a few thousand. This district is on the highway between India and Tibet. As the scenery is of surpassing beauty and grandeur and some good hunting ground is not far beyond, the road was frequented by

hunters and Government officials on vacations.

For years, there had been a custom known as Begar, whereby any Government official or European could demand from any village headman along the road the services of as many men as the traveller desired, at any time, for as long a period as he wanted, for carrying luggage or messages at an utterly inadequate wage. Also, they could be required to drive their cows to the dak bungalow (a sort of inn) and supply as much milk as the traveller desired, also at ridiculously low prices. Thus farmers, many more than were needed, could be haled away from ploughing, or sowing or harvesting their crops or any other pressing business, to suit the whims of any European who was on the road.

One of the local Indian leaders protested but he was immediately jailed and the villagers were threatened with talk of machine guns and the like. A Mr. S. E. Stokes, who was living on his estate in the district and operating an apple orchard, decided to organize the resistance against this injustice. He was in sympathy with Mr. Gandhi's ideas and worked out the plan on non-violent lines. But Mr. Gandhi himself had no part in the struggle.

The district elected a small committee or *panchayat* to direct the movement, of which Mr. Stokes was a leading member. In every village in the district all the people took an oath by their village gods to obey the orders of the committee and not to negotiate with the Government in this matter except through the committee.

The committee wrote out a long and carefully worded statement of the situation and its injustices and sent it to the District Commissioner. Hearings were requested, but no notice was taken of it by the Commissioner. Letters were written to all the responsible officials. Copies of all letters were retained by the committee. Still the Begar exactions continued. The committee then notified the Commissioner that, if the exactions were not ended on a stated date, the entire district would refuse all requests for service.

This brought action. The Commissioner came up from Simla and called a large meeting. He threatened and used every strategem he could to cause division between the different villages and castes, so as to break down the authority of the committee. But every man who was asked a question declined to answer,

saying that it was for the committee to do. They all refused service and no Government official or European travelling on that section of the road could get from them any food or service.

In a few weeks the District Commissioner had to accede to every single demand of the villagers' committee, and had to post all along the road printed rules which strictly limited the amount of service that could be asked and specified the wages. The struggle lasted several months and was a complete success in the district. The struggle was wholly free from violence by the farmers.

Another successful campaign of non-violent resistance took place in 1928 in Bordoli Taluka, a small district near Surat in Bombay Presidency, India. It was undertaken by the peasant inhabitants numbering about 88,000 to correct an economic injustice.

Contrary to the advice of the Joint Parliamentary Committee appointed to consider the Government of India Bill, 1919, and contrary to a resolution of the Legislative Council of Bombay Presidency in 1924, the Bombay Provincial Government in 1927 enhanced the rate of rural taxation very severely, nominally 22 per cent., but in actual application in

some instances over sixty per cent. The peasantry claimed that the investigation upon which the increase had been based was wholly inadequate, that the tax official's report was inaccurate and carelessly compiled, and that the increase was unwarranted and unjust. They asked the governor to appoint an independent and impartial committee of inquiry to hold a thorough public investigation of all the evidence. The government paid no attention to the request. Then, after giving due notice of their intentions, the peasants of the entire district refused to pay the tax.

The movement was led by Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, under the general guidance of Mr. Gandhi.

The government did its best to compel the peasants to pay the tax. It tried flattery and bribery with some, fines, floggings, and imprisonment against others. Then the Government officers seized and sold goods of the peasantry. It caused much of the peasants' land to be forfeited, and sold over 1,400 acres of such land at auction. It brought in numbers of Pathans who insulted and tried to terrorize the villagers. All along, there was a campaign of misrepresentation in the pro-government press against the pea-

santry and their leaders and sympathizers. The matter was discussed very fully in the Provincial legislature, in all the Indian press, and briefly even, I believe, in Parliament in London.

Through it all the peasants stood firm, yet non-violent. After five and a half months, the government had to yield to practically every one of the demands. Truth and justice prevailed over governmental "prestige." The governor appointed a committee of inquiry, agreed to restore all the land which had been sold or forfeited, and the village officials who had resigned were reinstated. And when the committee of inquiry made its report, it "substantially justified" the original complaints of the peasants and recommended a tax increase less than that which had been assessed by the Government. I understand that the division was put into effect.¹

In India there have been other instances of the successful use of organized mass non-violent resistance, as in the Ahmedabad mill strike in 1917, at Kheda in 1916-'17, at Borsad in 1923 and at Nagpur in 1927. All of these were conducted

1. See files of *Young India*, Ahmedabad, 1928 and early 1929 for full details. Also files of Bombay and other Indian papers and Journals.

or supervised by Mr. Gandhi. The Kheda and Borsad struggles were in regard to taxation, and the Nagpur struggle involved the right to parade with an Indian Nationalist flag.

The Akali Sikhs in the Punjab waged a magnificent non-violent struggle for a few years beginning in 1922 in behalf of their rights to control certain temple properties, in which they were partly successful.¹ Mr. Gandhi had no hand in this.

Besides these there was the all-India non-co-operation struggle of 1921-'22 which was unsuccessful in its immediate objective and yet immensely successful in awakening that country with its population of 320,000,000 people to a desire for freedom and to work concretely for its attainment. It profoundly altered the entire political situation in India, and thereby in the British Empire.²

We cannot attempt here to describe

1. For detailed accounts see the files of *The Manchester Guardian* and the *Nation*, New York, for 1922 and 1923, also Savel Zimand, *Living Ind'ia*, Chap. 13, Longmans Green, 1928.

2. For descriptions of this movement see *Young India* 1919-22-Ganesan, Madras and Huebsch, New York; Krishnadas—*Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi*—Vol. I, Ganesan, Madras, 1928, Vol. II, Rambinode Sinha, Dighwara, Behar, India, 1928; and Savel Zimand—*Living India*, Chaps. 11 and 12, above cited.

that momentous struggle, but it will be of interest to describe some of the practical details of organization of the movement. For example, let us take the all-India Volunteer Corps devised by Mr. Gandhi and adopted by the Working Committee of the All-India National Congress. Mr. Gandhi's former secretary describes it thus :¹

“Two volunteers would form a unit, and each unit would elect its own captain, to be called *Leader*. Twenty such leaders would among themselves elect one as their head, called *Officer*. All other officers would be appointed by the Provincial Board. In every province five members would form a Board or Central Committee of Control. The Board will elect its own Chairman. In this way Mahatmaji (Mr. Gandhi) conceived the plan of forming a vast well-knit, well disciplined body of non-violent soldiers for preserving the peace of the country. To put away from the minds of these volunteers all thoughts of their having to engage in a bloody fight, Mahatmaji took precaution at the very outset, and definitely laid down in his draft resolution that they should not adopt the uniform of soldiers, and they were positively forbidden to go about with swords. But if they so wished they might carry ordinary sticks, four feet long.

About their duties, Mahatmaji laid down that they would preserve peace and order, organize and

¹ Krishnadas, *Seven Months with Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. II, pp. 42, 43 cited above.

regulate meetings, processions and hartals,¹ and in case of emergency, would render social service under the direction of their leaders. Every volunteer would have to sign a pledge The first clause of that pledge was that the volunteer was to render implicit obedience to the orders of his superior officer. The second condition was that he was to observe non-violence in word and in deed, and inculcate the spirit of non-violence amongst others. A third condition was that he must be prepared to run all risks attendant upon the performance of his duties."

Inasmuch as non-violent resistance may also be used in labor strikes, it is interesting to see Mr. Gandhi's ideas as to the chief conditions of a successful strike. They are:—²

- "(1) Never to resort to violence.
- (2) Never to molest blacklegs (scabs).
- (3) Never to depend upon alms or Union funds.
- (4) To remain firm, no matter how long the strike continues, and to earn bread, during the strike,

1. A hartal is a total suspension of all trade and business as a demonstration of protest.

2. See M. K. Gandhi—*My Experiments with Truth*, Vol. II, Chaps. 20 and 22. Also *Young India* 1919-22, pp. 740-741; and *Young India* 1924-26, p. 952, both previously cited.

by any other honest temporary labor.

(5) The cause of the strike must be just.

(6) There should be practical unanimity among the strikers."

Mr. Gandhi believes in strong labor unions. He sanctions temporary picketing, comparing the pickets to the police who are really picketing against thieves.¹ He feels that sympathetic strikes are rarely advisable.

His conception of political self-Government, *Swaraj*, for India includes, of course, the upper classes, but it is primarily a mass movement. "Real *Swaraj*," he says, "will not come by the acquisition of authority by a few, but by the acquisition of the capacity to resist authority when it is abused. In other words, *Swaraj* is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority."² Also he stated, "Non-co-operation is an attempt to awaken the masses to a sense of their dignity and power."³ And all through his writings and speeches he repeats again and again that true freedom

1. *Young India* 1919-22, pp. 1124-1129.

2. *Young India*, Jan. 29, 1925.

3. *Young India*, Dec. 1, 1920.

can come only through the use of non-violent resistance.¹

In addition to the foregoing examples, we have witnessed in China immensely effective economic boycotts against foreign goods. These were predominantly non-violent in outward form, but to outsiders, at least, the principle of non-violence seemed to be not so much a matter of conscious choice as of social habit.

The principle of non-violent resistance for individual, personal use was conceived and applied independently by numerous seers and courageous people in many different countries. But Mr. Gandhi carried the principle one step further, because he has worked out the theory and applied it to mass movements in organized corporate fashion, and proved the validity of this extension by actual successful campaigns in numerous difficult situations. A careful examination of his deeds and writings indicates that he is one of the greatest strategists and reformers of all history. The word strategist is used here in its finest sense, as one who surveys

1. See the books already cited in this chapter. Also C. F. Andrews, *Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi*—Allen & Unwin, London and Macmillan, New York, 1929. At the end of the second volume of Krishnadas' book is an excellent summary of Mr. Gandhi's political ideas.

the battle-field and environment of mankind with remarkable breadth of vision and knowledge of detail, who knows the forces present and all the modes and occasions of conflict most profoundly and intimately and who develops, organizes and mobilizes the moral and spiritual strength and energies of mankind for the noblest social, economic and political ideals.¹

1 For other instances of the use of non-violent resistance either by individuals or in mass movements see the lives of Buddha and Christ and the early Quakers and Moravians. Also A. Fenner Brockway—*Non-Cooperation in other lands*, previously cited; C. M. Case—*Non-violent Coercion*—Century Co., New York and London, 1923; Adin Ballu—*Christian Non-Resistance*—2nd ed. Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, 1910; J. W. Graham—*Conscription and Conscience*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1922; Norman Thomas—*Is Conscience a Crime?*—Vanguard Press, New York, 1928; W. J. Chamberlain—*Fighting for Peace*—No More War Movement, London, 1929; J. H. Holmes—*New Wars for Old*—Dodd, Mead, New York, 1916; *The Arm of God*—Oliphants, Ltd., London.

VIII

DOUBTS AND QUERIES

DURING the Great War there was much severe criticism of conscientious objectors and pacifists, some of it emotional and vituperative, some sober and thoughtful. Even before that, most Western men of action and many Western philosophers believed that early Christian and Oriental belief and practice of non-violence and extreme gentleness were mistaken and weak. All this criticism represents so widespread and firmly held a body of feeling and conviction as to require somewhat detailed examination in the interests of a clear understanding of our subject. Many of the criticisms are different aspects of a larger general attitude, so that no one paragraph of our discussion will seem wholly adequate. Yet we will endeavor to cover in the course of the book all aspects known to us and a considerable number in this one chapter.

Probably the first and most widespread impression of non-violent resistance is that it is cowardly. The preceding chapters of this book ought to eliminate this charge completely. It is quite possible that mere non-violence or passivism may be cowardice, or that a coward might try to begin a course of non-violent resistance, but he could not keep it up unless he became courageous. Non-violent resistance is not mere non-violence; nor is it really passive or merely accepting what comes. It is a definite attempt to cope with opponents in a clear-cut, positive, courageous, disciplined way. It does not stop short with a mere refusal to do violence. It goes beyond that with strong, creative activity. It is not "negative," nor is it "slothful," "indifference," "easy-going mentality" or "spiritual inertia," to quote a few of the war time epithets. This much surely is clear from our preceding discussion of the psychology, strategy and discipline of non-violent resistance.

Much of the clamor against non-violent resisters seems to be based on the theory that they are staying at home in safety, afraid to face the dangers and hardships that the soldiers are undergoing. But that is not true. They are

ready to face privation, losses of all kinds, shot and shell, poison gas, bombardment, bayonets, clubbings, imprisonment, wounds and death. They require the opponents, however, to take the initiative in violence and maintain all the violence. The burden of violence is to rest entirely on the opponents. The resisters will suffer and endure. Their mode of struggle and how and why it works has been already explained. Well-trained, non-violent resisters do not succumb to the varieties of fear such as flight, concealment, silence, clinging to a protector, shrinking from danger, physical immobility for simulation of death, crying out for protection, or defense by violent aggressive actions.

Although among the militarists there is superb devotion, utmost self-sacrifice, and fine idealism, they are mistaken in assuming that they are the only ones who possess courage, or that willingness to engage in war is the ultimate proof of courage. In sober reality, their chief reliance is fear, both in respect to their enemies and themselves. Wars are waged chiefly because of fear, or greed, which is an inverted fear. The main object of war is to create such fear in the heart and mind of the enemy as to break his will. And among their own respective national

groups, the militarists use fear nowadays both to raise armies and to create and maintain discipline. Practically all modern armies in war time and many in peace time are, and have to be raised, by conscription, that is to say, compulsion or fear. The individual fear of the herd decision is the operating factor. As Kempf remarks,¹ "The frigidity of the social void is too terrible to be braved except by the most courageous." Men prefer to take the risk of death and wounds in battle rather than be cut off from their own kind.

At the beginning of the Great War, Great Britain tried to raise her army by the volunteer system. That brought in the few who loved fighting and the glamour of war, those who were stirred by humanitarian motives in relation to other invaded nations, and those who were animated by other altruistic motives. There was considerable social compulsion also at this stage.

"Social compulsion was just as much force as was conscription. In the second year of the war, it reached extraordinary intensity. Women went around bestowing white feathers upon all men of mili-

1. *Autonomic Functions and the Personality*, previously cited, p. 94.

tary age not in uniform. Employers dismissed men who would not join up. Society placed its ban upon them. Orators, newspapers and posters united in stigmatizing them as cowards and slackers until all but the most insensitive were driven into the ranks. It came in part from the soldiers—one of the very first effects that a uniform has upon the soul of its wearer is to generate in him a fierce, irrational desire to see every one else in khaki. Parents who had lost sons were particularly vehement, naturally so. The older men, the women and those who were exempt were humanly anxious that every one else should defend the country. It was a blind, cruel, indiscriminating, sometimes altogether shameful, method of compulsion. As a result, it was difficult to retain even the most indispensable in civil service...Men very often told me they volunteered because they were cowards. The motive that decided the question was simply *fear*—a fear that overbalanced whatever other fears they may have had...I cannot give definite figures, but I have the impression that at least half of the total British army was conscripted. To this we must add the regular professional army and the Territorials (who had no choice in the matter) and the very large number who were driven in by

social compulsion."¹ All of this quotation would apply equally well to any Western nation which would try to raise its army in similar fashion.

No one can question the existence of courage in soldiers. Nevertheless, it is somewhat one-sided. It is perhaps shown mostly in relation to the enemy.²

It is clear that non-violent resistance, on the other hand, tries to control, discipline and reduce fear as well as anger in *all* relationships, public and private, toward both members of the group and opponents. Clearly its adherents are not less courageous than those who believe in violence on occasion.³

Closely allied to this charge of cowardice are several psychological criticisms. It has been alleged that non-violent resistance is merely a specious attempt to put a bold appearance upon what is really a fear of personal safety; that it is what

1. T. H. Proctor—*The Motives of the Soldier*, 31 International Journal of Ethics, p. 26, Oct. 1920.

2. For some interesting remarks about moral courage among officers see (Sir) General Ian Hamilton, *The Soul and Body of the Army*, p. 133. Edw. Arnold, London, 1921.

3. See testimony of military officers in accord, cited in Chap. X and XI of *Non-violent Coercion* by C. M. Case, The Century Co., New York and London, 1923; and Major Kellogg—*The Conscientious Objector*—Boni and Leveright, New York, 1919.

the psychologists call a "rationalization of fear," that is a mode of conduct motivated in the last analysis by fear. If that were true, then we would have to say that all medical science has the motive of fear behind it; that all the science and art of agriculture is a rationalization of the fear of starvation; that all industry is a rationalization of the fear of poverty. Of course, if one wishes one may call these things such names and attribute such motives, but if one does so that merely means that *all* intelligence is a rationalization of some fear relating to life. Hence, it is to be wondered what such an allegation (made by a presumably intelligent person) is a rationalization of—whether a fear of being considered an ally of the unfashionable, or merely a dread of the unknown.

Some psychologists have asserted that non-violent resistance is really only a manifestation of the instinct of self-abasement, if there be such an instinct. But MacDougal¹ says that this instinct "expresses itself in a slinking, crest-fallen behaviour, a general diminution of muscular tone, slow restricted movements, a hanging down of the head, and sidelong

I. *Social Psychology*—P. 64, 12th Ed. Boston and London, 1917.

glances. In the dog, the picture is completed by the sinking of the tail between the legs...with every mark of submission." This picture is very far from the bearing of all the non-violent resisters known to the author, very different from the thousands of British and American conscientious objectors who went to prison during the War for the sake of their principles, and very far from their psychology as explained in the preceding chapter of this book. MacDougal is responsible, I believe, for the idea that there is a specific instinct of self-abasement, but by his own description it does not include non-violent resistance among its manifestations.

One psychologist¹ asserted that pacifism is a distorted form of "the instinct of concealment" or flight or shamming death. All these are manifestations of fear, and do not apply to the conduct under discussion, as has been seen. Shamming death involves complete suppression of all movement or utter avoidance of the threatening force.² This does not con-

1. Frederic Lyman Wells, *The Instinctive Basis of Pacifism*—118 *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, U.S.A.) p. 44, July, 1916.

2. See p. 62 of Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, previously cited.

form to the conduct of the non-violent resister.

It has been alleged¹ that non-violent resistance is an over-desire for martyrdom, a theatrical posing as heroism, and really masochism. The *Encyclopedia Americana* defines masochism as "a term used in analytic psychology to denote a tendency, usual in infancy and early childhood but outgrown or sublimated in later life, to take pleasure in having pain inflicted upon oneself." White defines it as "the gratification of the sexual feeling by suffering pain—real or simulated."²

From all our previous psychological analysis and the record of non-violent resisters, it is clear that there is nothing infantile or sexual about this mode of conduct in question. Nor is there any psychological submission in it. Non-violent resisters are not seeking suffering for its own sake or for any invented pleasure to be derived from it. If suffering must come in order to attain their ends, they accept it and bear it with clear-eyed facing of reality, as does a good soldier. It is true that non-violent resistance

1. Cf. Frederic Lyman Wells above cited.

2. W. A. White—*Outlines of Psychiatry* 7th ed. 1919. Nervous and Mental Disease Publ. Co., Washington, D. C.

seeks to be creative, and that almost any form of valuable creation involves suffering, as in the case of great artists and musicians, great writers and all mothers. But we do not charge any of these persons with a desire to enjoy suffering for its own sake. Just because non-violent resistance is new to many people, they seem to think it is psychologically abnormal. But that is shallow thinking. Pain is as old as anger and fighting, and anesthetics are a relatively new method of controlling pain ; but is the manipulative activity of the anesthetician, *abnormal* or theatrical merely because it is new? (Of course, as a matter of fact non-violent resistance is at least 2500 years old, although it may seem new to some Westerners.) If it were correct or fair to call non-violent resistance a form of masochism, then, by the same line of careless reasoning, it would be equally correct and fair to call war and violence merely a form of sadism, which is a tendency to take pleasure in inflicting pain upon others, connected likewise with sexual feelings. No good soldier or person of sound judgment would admit such a charge.

For the same reasons, non-violent resistance cannot be classed as a perse-

cution complex, or self-hero worship, or a form of self-pity, as certain critics have insinuated. A few emotional believers in non-violent resistance may have pitied themselves when they suffered for it. But this is not inherent in the method. Some soldiers and mothers have indulged in self-pity, too, but that does not make soldiering or motherhood a form of self-pity. Nor again, is it a rationalization of laziness. The non-violent resister is thoroughly active in body, mind and feelings. Some psychologists with a subconscious predilection for the romance of war may say that non-violent resistance is only a Freudian substitute or compensation for the strong man's "open and courageous revenge." If so, let them read again the previous chapters and try to look further than tomorrow in their psychological analysis. Is it a Freudian compensation for inferiority of some sort? Conceivably, in some cases but perhaps no more so nor any more provable than to say that Napoleon's dominating will power and military efficiency were a compensation for his small stature. But the intellectual, emotional and physical variety of non-violent resisters or conscientious objectors is too great to permit any such generalization as that. Is there any pronounced inferi-

ority, for instance, in Bertrand Russell, such as would lead him into this belief? Intellectually, at any rate, the conscientious objectors in the United States during the War were found to be on a high level.¹

Another group of critics have asserted that non-violent resisters are selfish, self-centered, intent on saving only their own souls even if the rest of their countrymen perish. But the record of these men before and after wars proves this to be untrue.² And if they were imprisoned or interned in camps during war time, their inactivity under such circumstances can hardly be called evidence of egotism or selfishness. No one could accuse Christ or Buddha or Gandhi of being unaware of or inactive in respect to their social obligations. Doubtless, they and their followers are individualistic in the sense that they do not follow the herd in time of war, but they are not selfish or anti-social. If

1. See article by Prof. Marsh May *The Psychological Examination of Conscientious Objectors* in *American Journal of Psychology* for April 1920, p. 152; also Chapter X and XI of *Non-violent Coercion* by C. M. Case: Century Co., New York and London, 1923.

2. See Major W. G. Kellogg, *The Conscientious Objector*, Boni & Liveright, New York, 1919; Norman Thomas, *Is Conscience a Crime*, Vanguard Press, New York, 1927.

certain men firmly believe that fighting does *not* preserve those things in a nation which are truly worth while, that it is *not* a means to security, but that other modes of action are wiser, and are willing to sacrifice all in and for that other mode, can they fairly be called selfish? There is more than one way of proving one's usefulness even in time of war. Those people who accuse a non-violent resister of selfishness are usually thinking only of that resister's relation to his own nation and government and the army which he is being urged to join. They overlook the effect of all the proposed violence upon the opposed army and its people. It might be selfish to refuse to undergo hardships and mortal dangers, but if these result in hardships and deaths of other opposing men perhaps it is not quite so selfish. Possibly the human species is more important than any particular national institution; for institutions are only group habits. The group may find other and better habits.

Another group of critics, of whom Roosevelt and Lenin are outstanding examples, considers non-violent resistance a form or evidence of weakness. They pile on many stinging adjectives and epithets such as mollicoddle, supine, ser-

vile, spineless, anemic idealism, sheep's paradise, weakly humane, vacillation, soft-fibred, emasculation, sentimental tosh, desire for ease and comfort, begging for mercy, flabby, impotent, pap and babble, lacking in firmness, a certain trashiness of fibre, indolence, sentimental amiability, an open confession of reluctance to accept the whole burden of the moral life, swinish longing for opulent ease, affluent lethargy, "herbivorous animals, tame and harmless barn-yard poultry," effeminate, lacking in vitality, "an imaginative dislike of the unpleasant," weakling, softy, saccharine.

What has already been said disposes of most of these charges and their implications. One or two points may serve to clarify thought and feeling about this idea. Do not forget the word, *resistance*, in the phrase, "non-violent resistance." Remember that idealism is essential to good government as well as to all human progress. Many of the strongest forces in the world seem soft in certain aspects and conditions. The roots of trees, though soft, can split the hardest rocks. Water is soft but it, too, when freezing, splits rocks, and when falling drives huge turbines and carves out a Grand Canyon of the Colorado. Soft warm spring winds

bring out buds, leaves and things as no hard, swiftly-driven axe or saw could do. Soft clouds carry all the water for all the rivers in the world.¹ Meekness is not a crawling servility, but a far-sighted appreciation of a right sense of proportion and perspective in human affairs, a true historical understanding. Women do probably more work, have more endurance, show more courage, possess more practicability than men. A somewhat slighter musculature may be evidence of difference of physiological function, but not of virtue. Those who use the word *effeminate* as a term of contempt may profitably meditate upon a lioness at bay and the fact that modern war pays very slight attention to sex difference.

Sentimentalism or sentimentality are used in two different senses. Peirce² defines sentimentalism as "the doctrine that great respect should be paid to the natural judgments of the human heart." Lord says³, "There is thus revealed a

1. Lao Tsu and certain Indian mystics expressed this sort of truth very clearly.

2. Charles S. Peirce, *Chance, Love and Logic*, p. 274, Harcourt, Brace, New York, and Kegan, Paul, London p. 923.

3. Herbert G. Lord, *The Psychology of Courage*, Luce & Co. Boston, 1918.

marked difference between sentimentality and sentiment. In the former the action produced by ideas stops with emotion; in the latter, it passes on, reinforced and heated, into action." Contrary to the general impression, the ideas of the non-violent resister do not stop with mere emotion, but pass on into action, even though that action does not take the form of violence toward anyone. His action is constructive even while it is resistant.

Allied with the conception of weakness is that of inefficiency, impracticalness and general inability to think straight and see life whole. This is more or less connoted by such phrases as "an oversimplification of the problems of force and war," "a disregard of plain and obvious teachings of experience and history," simple naivete, innocence, ethical optimism, utopian vagueness of thinking pseudo-humanitarian vapourings, irrational romanticism, sloppy folly, not intellectually respectable, "a miserable pipe-dream," not common sense, imbecile, stupidity, gibberish, twaddle, barren of accomplishment, futile.

But non-violent resistance does involve real risks and action to remove real

wrongs. It is not sentimentality or weakness. It recognizes the existence of evil and cruel wrongs in the world and works with devotion, energy and self-sacrifice to eradicate them.

In the West, pacifism has been accused of being barren both in accomplishment and technique. It may well be so if it is not true non-violent *resistance*, and the two get confused in the Western mind. Non-violent resistance may seem barren in the West because there it has seldom been tried. It has seldom been tried because it has seldom been understood. It has not been understood because it did not seem reasonable. But now psychology has sufficiently developed to help us to understand intellectually the mechanism of this thing. Now it can be shown to be rational, capable of study, of understanding, of practice. We may expect the impression of barrenness to fade away. Part of the impression is due merely to prejudice or habit of mind. For example, if a non-violent resister suffers death for his principles, the militarists call it futile; but if a man fights and dies in battle, they call it glorious, irrespective of whether the cause is won or lost.

Where non-violent resistance has

been used with intelligence it is effective.¹

As previously pointed out, its failures have been almost entirely due to lack of discipline or failure by its users to understand it really and trust it wholly. While men are feeling their way toward a new understanding of themselves and surer controls of the forces of nature, there are of course many fumbling attempts and more or less complete failures. For many thousands of years men who tried to fly were scoffed at and derided for their folly. They were a smaller band than the non-violent resisters. Yet who doubts man's ability to fly now? If we can discipline our fear, as in war, we can learn to discipline our anger in non-violent resistance. Once you understand it, it does not seem so impractical. If, after persuing this book carefully and thinking it over, the reader still considers that non-violent resistance is any more romantic, or cloudy-minded, or less realistic than war, we would welcome his specific criticisms. The mere long prevalence of war is no proof of its inevitableness or necessity, any more than in the case of the long prevalence

1. For its record see Chapter VII and the references there given.

of slavery, or flint and steel for fire making, or the use of the pine torch for illumination, etc.

J. B. S. Haldane, in an article called *Science and Ethics* in *Harpers Magazine* for June, 1928, says "the present moral crisis is due, among other things, to the demand for a moral code which shall be intellectually respectable. The existence of that demand, encouraged as it is by the success of rationalism in the sphere of science, is no doubt a serious matter, but the demand is growing daily. . . ." Modern developments in psychology have perhaps made it possible to begin to understand the workings of non-violent resistance with our minds as well as intuitively. Does it not begin to assume an aspect of intellectual respectability? It need no longer be the sole property of those whom the world thinks of as dreamers, mystics or fanatics.

Nobody is so silly as to deny that force does not exist all through the universe, or that destruction is not a phenomenon of all life. But it is an absurd jump of logic to assert on that basis that the life of the human species is preserved or rendered more secure or enriched or heightened in value by inter-human war and violence. The biological

and philosophical aspects of non-violent resistance will be discussed more fully, however, in a later chapter.

Non-violent resistance is not a thing incapable of actually being put to work until we reach some far-off millenium. It is practical for you and me and everyone, here and now. The argument that it is utopian is like one which is often used against Socialism.

“Why advocate Socialism? It is asked. Until men are perfect it is impossible. When they are perfect, it will be unnecessary. So here. Why advocate peace? Until men are worthy of it, it is impossible. When they are worthy of it, it will come of itself. Of course, the answer is that in neither case is there a dilemma. Men are neither wholly perfect or imperfect, neither wholly worthy or unworthy. They are in a transition stage, and the very advocacy will help to bring about the worthiness that will make the desired good possible...”¹ The understanding and practice of non-violent resistance will help even more to make mankind worthy of peace.

Let us now discuss some more detailed criticisms.

1. *Is Mankind Worthy of Peace*—By W. M. Urban, 27 Int. J. of Ethics, 293 at p. 303.

It is asserted that non-violent resistance means peace at any price. This is not so. The non-violent resister recognizes that peace does require a price, but he does not ask others to pay the price before himself. He steps forward and pays the first instalment of the price himself, and continues to pay until others are constrained to share in the expense by force of example. He perhaps estimates more accurately than the militarist the full, long-time price we pay for war, violence, anger and hate, those things which enforce the kind of "peace" which we now endure. The true non-violent resister pays, as utterly and completely as any soldier, with his life and treasure of every sort. Only he is more realistic than the soldier, for he knows that other men beside himself have carried on the ideals of the world and even of his own country, and that they may be trusted to do so even though, and probably just because, he sacrifices himself for those ideals. Many of the people who accuse non-violent resisters of wanting peace at any price usually want only their own very special brand of peace and want other people to pay most of the price. Or, at least they want to have the opportunity to try to compel others to pay most of the price.

Professor Ralph Barton Perry in his book, *The Free Man and the Soldier*¹, wields a vigorous pen against the pacifists. On page 101 there is the following passage :

“Nor will it suffice to quote Plato, and take comfort in the thought that the ideals are themselves eternal and incorruptible. For that which enemies threaten and champions defend, is not the ideal itself, but some earthly mortal thing which is made in its image. The labor and art of life is not to create justice and happiness in the abstract, but to build just cities and happy lives. And these can be burned with fire and slain by the sword. If one is prepared to renounce the existent world and the achievements of history, one may perhaps escape the need of war. But let no man fail to realize that he has then virtually given up the whole achievement of the race, all the fruits of all the painful toil of men, even the spiritual fruits of culture and character. For these spiritual fruits are individual lives which may be as utterly destroyed as the work of man's hands. It is futile to argue that the good life cannot be destroyed by an enemy. It is true that it cannot be corrupted and made evil. But it may be killed. The good life is more than mere goodness; it is a *living* goodness, embodied in existence and conduct. He who slays a just man or annihilates a free and happy society, undoes the work of moral progress as fatally, nay, more fatally, than he who corrupts them with injustice and slavery. For in the latter case there at least remain the latent

1. Scribners, New York, 1916. Also in an article *What is Worth Fighting for*—Atlantic Monthly, Dec. 1915, Boston, U.S.A.

capacities by which civilization may be rebuilt. Those who insist on the distinction between might and right and accuse the warrior of practicing might in the name of right, are likely on their part to forget that the work of civilization is to make the right also *mighty*, so that it may obtain among men and prevail. This end is not to be realized by any philosophy of abstinence and contemplation, but only by a use of the physical forces by which things are brought to exist and by which alone they are made secure against violence and decay."

The non-violent resister, however, is more realistic and scientific in his thinking than all this. He recognizes that no matter what his beliefs and convictions are, he may possibly be mistaken or at fault. This he realizes even though millions of people share in his convictions. The validity of his caution seems justified by the continued existence of many hoary errors and by many of the experiences and revelations of the Great War. Indeed, the passions of war time are certain to cause grave errors of judgment.

As a corollary of this reservation, he recognizes that the militarist may possibly be mistaken in thinking that his particular system of thought, belief, ideals or institutions are sufficiently worth while preserving to justify killing people who oppose them. If the non-violent resister has made a mistake, he is

ready to suffer for it himself, but he tries to bear the whole burden himself and shrinks from allowing his opponent to suffer if he can prevent it. Possibly the ideals that are best for all humanity may be sufficiently worth while for that, but possibly he is mistaken in thinking that his ideals are of that universal nature.

Professor Perry seems to overlook this possibility of error.

Some militarists tend to confuse ideals with a particular set of institutions and some of them are more apt to fight for the institutions than for the ideals, with the belief that an ideal can be expressed by only one particular, fixed, familiar kind of institution. And they fail to see that "it is not dying which is the distinctive act of war, but killing." ¹

A non-violent resister believes that killing or harming another man is *not* the essential proof of his own courage, nor the only courageous or effective mode of struggle. He believes that if he stoutly proclaims and stands by and works for an ideal and is killed for it without himself doing violence, that such action is far more apt to arouse and even create

1. G. F. Nicolai—*The Biology of War*, P. 106—Century Co., New York & London, 1918.

other strong upholders and builders of that ideal who will make it continue to live creatively among men than if he were to kill or injure some other men who are opponents of that ideal. True, if he were violent, he might be killed while trying to kill others. But that attempt to kill or injure others tends to indicate, in the minds of those open to influence, a possibility of selfishness which somehow detracts from the force of his example. Certainly that is the argument among his foes, at least. But the violent death of a non-violent resister while upholding his ideal exerts an exceedingly powerful influence among his opponents as well as his friends. His utter sincerity has no drag of even a suspicion of selfishness. His example is certain to strengthen, in the lives of other men, the force of his ideal.

Mr. Leyton Richards puts it thus¹ :—

“.....All moral values go by the board in the act of war; and we therefore smite the very thing we desire to preserve whenever we resort to arms for the maintenance of moral values. Such values, indeed, can neither be destroyed nor maintained by physical weapons, but only as men are either false to them or faithful to them as the case may be.

1. *The Christian's Alternative to War*. Macmillan, New York, 1929, also London, p. 123.

Spiritual things can be attacked or defended only by spiritual means."

(We would prefer to say for most of life, "by people and material things working or used only for a spiritual purpose and in a spiritual or idealistic way.")

The soldier seems to think that unless he kills *somebody else*, his own particular kind of ideal will not live. The non-violent resister, on the other hand, believes that many ideals have been maintained and transmitted without violence before he was born, that many other men are as capable as himself of carrying on the ideals of the world and even of his own country, and that they may be trusted to do so even though and probably just because he allows himself to be killed while stoutly maintaining those ideals, yet without violence.

It has often been asserted that pacifism exaggerates the value of human life; that it fails to see that certain ideals which give life value are more important than life itself. For this reason pacifists are accused of being materialists at heart, of imagining that physical wounds are worse than mental or moral outrages. The idealistic militarist says:—

"At best I can feel but a conditional reverence for human life. I cannot make it a fetish. It

derives its sanctity from its relation to something holier than itself. To preserve it at the expense of that something holier—that Honor, Justice, Service, Goodwill, which are the proper objects of its loyalty and self-expenditure—is to preserve the instrument at the expense of the music which the instrument is designed to produce.

"I frankly confess that my ideal is not the preservation of human life, but the preservation of a certain type of human life; and the establishment of those principles under which this type of human life can best survive seems to me more important than the preservation of human life itself." ¹

Again,

"To those who understand spiritual values, the death of the body is not the last disaster, nor is a condition of peaceful prosperity the highest good." ² Mr. Lovejoy remarked³ that pacifism involves "a generalization that there never has been at stake, and never will be, any human good sufficiently important to be worth fighting for." Also that it was an abominable thing that rational beings should knowingly sacrifice a greater good to a lesser."

Mr. Park, in the article quoted from

1. *Why are you not a Pacifist?*—by Charles E. Park—119 Atlantic Monthly 745, June 1917, Boston, U.S.A.

2. *The Problem of Conscience* by W. B. Selbie, 14 Hilbert Journal, p. 725, Oct. 1916.

3. *To Conscientious Objectors* by Arthur O. Lovejoy, 2 New Republic, p. 187, June 16, 1917. See also *Some Anti-Militarist Fallacies* by G. R. Stirling Taylor, 19th Century, May 1923, Vol. 93, p. 633.

just above, argues that human life is sacred so long as it is loyal to the Divine Purpose, but the sacredness disappears as soon as that loyalty disappears. He proceeds,

"Of course, the question at once arises, but who is to be the judge of this loyalty to the Divine Purpose? How can you presume to say what the Divine Purpose is? And unless you can say what it is, how can you dare to affirm that a fellow creature is or is not loyal to it?

"Aye, there's the rub. It all comes back to the question of the reliability of the human judgment. For after all, it is the human judgment that must attempt to define the Divine Purpose, and that must, through that definition, impute worth or worthlessness to human life.

"The pacifist affirms that human judgment is too fallible to assume the stupendous responsibility of framing such a definition. I venture to reply that, if that is the case, then we are all at sea, and the sooner we give up the game of living, the better. I do not for a moment argue the infallibility of the human judgment. All I have to say is, that human judgment, such as it is, with all its narrowness, pride, passion and bigotry, is still the best guide we possess. It gives us *some* headway, at least, some steerageway. And while that steerageway may be, and probably is, in a direction that only approximates the direction of true growth, it is still infinitely better than no steerageway at all....."

The non-violent resister does not deny for an instant that certain ideals

are more important than physical life. He believes that if there are certain moral or spiritual values more important than physical life, then that justifies him in sacrificing himself for them, but not necessarily in sacrificing another against his will.

It is not merely that he feels the judgment of mankind to be fallible, though such fallibility has been clearly enough exemplified by the disclosures during and after the Great War.

He believes that dying for one's ideals, with non-violent resistance, makes those ideals live, but by killing or wounding another person for the sake of his own ideals, the result is a maiming or killing of those ideals as well. Some believe that this process also was exemplified by the Great War. If life is to be sacrificed it must be voluntarily surrendered without resistance. The non-violent resister believes there should be no violent taking of human life but only a giving of it. The voluntary giving of a life produces a profounder realization *by all* of the ultimate unity of all human life and of the reality, value and power of ideals, and also subsequent action upon that realization, that any taking or swapping of lives can accomplish. If human life is to

some extent sacred, the voluntary giving of it tends to make it more sacred, but the taking or injuring of another's life against his will does not help make any life more sacred.

The non-violent resister is willing to bet his own life upon the truth of his convictions and ideals, but he will not attempt to risk the life of another against that other's will. Like Mr. Park, the non-violent resister feels compelled to trust his own best judgment for his own guidance and action, but he does not feel "all at sea" or ready to "give up the game of living" merely because he cannot, on occasion, kill someone else out of sheer idealism or for any other reason.

Another gentleman argues thus:— "Physical life and all material resources are but means to human welfare, and must be subordinated, nay, sacrificed, to its interests...In peaceful times we wear out physical life gradually on its behalf, and in so doing maintain it; in time of war we offer up on its behalf physical life all at once."¹ He may be right that under present conditions the difference between peace-time and war-time destruction of life is largely one of time-

1. *The Apocalypse of War*—Anon., 14 Hilbert Journal 512, at p. 518.

scale only. But it is no more right for me to slowly starve or poison or bleed to death another person than to do it rapidly by swords, guns, navies, explosives and poison gas. One may wear himself out gradually for the public welfare if one wishes, or others may voluntarily follow his example, but he may not rightly compel them by violence to do so.

It is said that non-violent resistance is a surrender of the right of self-defense. Not so. It changes radically the method of defense and perhaps somewhat enlarges the conception of the self, but the defense is still there, active, alert and effective.

Some one said that it exaggerates war's horrors and undervalues its idealisms. The recent crop of war stories by soldiers, seems to cover the matter of war's horrors without any further comment from others. Many soldiers are obeying their consciences as sensitively and devotedly as any non-violent resister or any saint. The idealisms of warriors are recognized and praised by every lover of the truth, among whom the non-violent resister strives to be numbered. We have tried to express such fair valu-

ation in the opening chapter of this book.

Is it a desire for bloodlessness rather than for peace? No, for the non-violent resister is ready to offer his own blood, though not to take that of another. But he believes that certain kinds of peace are only the peace of a jail, maintained solely by violence and bloodshed. He would strive to replace such peaces by others more secure, more prosperous and more happy because more in harmony with the best and most fundamental characteristics of human nature.

Then there is the charge that the non-violent resister in time of war is and has been accepting all the benefits of the government, the vigilance, energy, devotion, self-sacrifice, blood and treasure of soldiers and others, but is refusing to aid the government in its time of danger. He is called mean, dishonorable, a poltroon, a slacker, a parasite. He will not himself commit what he considers a sin, but is willing to let others do it and then he takes the benefit. Contrast with him the soldier. "The essential thing in the character of the soldier thus appears, he is *the man who declines to take shelter from those perils at the cost of anybody else*. This unwillingness to be the protected person

an expression of the one characteristic instinct of manhood, seems to me to be the quality from which all the more particular military virtues are derived." ¹

Let us consider this charge in two separate cases, first, where the non-violent resister has held this belief and lived accordingly for a reasonable period before the particular war threatened; and second, where he reached his belief only at or soon after the declaration of war, perfectly sincerely but only waked up to a full realization and understanding of war by the impact of the fact itself.

Assuming that he has been a non-violent resister for some time, what is his situation? He is in a world that believes in war. His parents did not consult him as to where he should be born or brought up. The governments of all countries believe in war and practise it. It will do him no good to leave his own country. He cannot find another free from war beliefs. Besides, he may be too poor to go. And why should he try to escape, merely to clear his own skirts from wrong? He is like a man who believes in fresh clear air but finds his business keeps him in the smoky city of London

I. W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U. S. A. 1918, p. III.

or St. Louis. Although he gets the benefit of such air as exists, is he not justified in staying there and agitating for the abolition of the smoke nuisance? May a believer in good government not consistently live in a city or country whose government is bad and work to try to improve it? Can he not work more efficiently among people whose minds, feelings, attitudes, habits and language he knows best? Meanwhile he is of course accepting whatever benefits may come from the partial goodness of that government. But if a corrupt mayor and city council, without his consent or possible control, run the city into fearful debt, would he be morally dishonourable in refusing to pay his taxes and perhaps starting a suit in the courts to somehow correct or alleviate the wrong? Would that be a base parasitic action as respects the other taxpayers?

The non-violent resister inclines to believe that his national government has received from him all he owes it in the past and present merely by paying taxes, minding his own business, being orderly, clean, industrious, kind and neighborly. True, Christ said, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," but query whether Caesar is entitled to compel a

man to kill others or to attempt to "defend" the country (i.e., the government) by killing. Such a type of "defense" perhaps has not and does not give the citizen such great advantages and benefits after all. Its expenses are an appalling burden.

For example, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, shows that 82 per cent. of the taxes of that government go to pay the bills of past wars and of preparation for future wars. This enters into the cost of all manufactured articles and therefore affects every citizen.

According to figures in the Statesmen's Year Book for 1926, during the year 1924 to 1925, sixty seven per cent. of the total national expenditure of Great Britain went to pay for armaments and past wars. Britain seems to spend less than the United States partly because much of the British army expense is allocated to India.

Sir Josiah Stamp has made careful estimates of the amounts of taxation for armaments and its direct and indirect effects.¹ After allowing for these he

1. Sir J. Stamp—*Current Problems in Finance and Government*, Chap. IV, especially p. 97.

says, "One could state, without much fear of serious error, that the standard of life throughout great industrial powers would be lifted by ten per cent. by the cancellation of the expenditure on armaments. Such an increase would have a much greater influence upon the comforts of life and on the economic well-being of the people, than the mere figure itself might convey. At the stage at which we stand, *it is for the mass of the people of these nations, the difference between grinding penury and a reasonable standard of comfort.*"

Professor Bogart has estimated¹ that the total direct and indirect costs of the Great War amounted to \$ 337,946,179,657. Professor Baker of the University of London says that this sum is "the equivalent of twenty full years' work of the brain workers, hand workers and mechanical equipment of the British Isles."² Bogart says of these figures:—"Yet even these do not take into account the effect of the war on life, human vitality, economic well-being, ethics, morality, or other phases of human relationships and acti-

1. Ernest L. Bogart—*Direct and Indirect costs of the Great World War*—Carnegie Endowment for International Peace—Oxford Univ. Press, 1919.

2. P. J. Noel Baker—*Disarmament*—Hogarth Press, London, 1926, pp. 11-12.

vities which have been disorganized and injured." Professor Baker states various other indirect burdens of armament which are very heavy, although impossible to estimate, such as the organization on uneconomic lines of transport systems of the world, for strategic and war purposes; elaborate frontier barriers and customs tariffs; the tremendously rapid wastage of resources of iron, coal and oil in time of war; exoduses of refugees; famines, disease, destruction of markets, demoralization of international exchange, money inflation and deflation, unemployment, hatred, suspicion, bitter rivalries, general post-war tendency to civil lawlessness and violence, moral callousness.¹ All these do not add to the security or blessings of the citizen.

Granted that there have been some great benefits from some activities of governments, yet there also are and have been very severe burdens from their wars.

The author is not an anarchist. Neither is he a Socialist or Communist.

1. For other data as to the cost of war see also F. B. Boeckel—*Between War and Peace*—Macmillan, New York, 1925, Ch. 25; A. G. Pigou—*The Political Economy of War*—London; S. Dumas and K. O. Vedel-Peterson—*Losses of Life Caused by War*—Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Oxford University Press, London, 1923.

Governments of some sort may be necessary, but it is poverty of thought to insist that just because in the past they have always been violent, they must forever remain so. The benefits of orderly living are enormous, but most people are orderly because of the long experience of the society in which they grew up, their habits, common sense and generally prevailing goodwill, not because of armies, legislators, police and courts. We will discuss the place of these in a subsequent chapter but at this part of the discussion we will simply assert our belief that law is highly over-rated as a factor in people's orderliness. The judges and administrators admit this when they enunciate the well known doctrine that ignorance of the law is no excuse for the criminal. Governments have doubtless had considerable effect in moulding people's habits, but perhaps not so much in relation to every day orderly decent living as many suppose.

If these things be so, perhaps the non-violent resister is not so much of a parasite and slacker as some have imagined. He has been carrying the burdens of government, although he considers them wrong and unfair. He does not take shelter from peril, but he does not go

forth to provoke it as the militarists do. He is ready to pay his share of the costs of the society in which he is placed, but he believes he has the right at all times to try to reduce that item of the cost of living which is due to war, whether that burden is financial or otherwise.

To all this, reply might be made that the soldier is bearing these burdens of high taxation, poverty and civil discord, and in addition he is bearing the heavy burden of military service with all that it implies of hardship, danger, disablement, sacrifice and death. But military service has a debit as well as a credit side. If you believe in it you look at the credit side. If you believe in something else, you look at the debit side. The non-violent resister, while admiring the devotion of the soldier, believes that the soldier is mistaken, and that a more careful and less conventional study of history, public finance, psychology and ethics would show that the soldier by his military service is really creating an extra burden for himself and others, not lightening burdens which otherwise would fall more heavily on others.

Suppose that the non-violent resister has just recently become such by reason of a discovery of his former error. Does

a man not have the right to repent his mistakes at any time? Otherwise, how could there ever be individual or social progress? He believes that by fighting he would *not* be truly defending the fine things of his country, but only certain hardened institutionalisms which would be better for being shaken out in the open, fully exposed to hostile as well as friendly criticism, and then, if need be, revamped in the interest of a more harmonious and more widely prosperous world.

If he has a sensitive conscience he may feel that he had not earned in peacetime the right to be a non-violent resister in war-time. He had never before actively opposed war or the roots of war. Since he shares in the guilt of others, he feels that he must share in the consequences. Therefore, he feels he must join the army and fight against his conscience. But let him not fret too much about not sharing the consequences. If he refuses to be drafted, his government will probably make him suffer and may kill him. In any event, he may be sure that he will have to work harder all his life to pay for the war, and will meet with countless troubles arising out of the hatreds and wrongs it engenders. The body of

humanity is one, and we all suffer from its evils, no matter what our position. He will earn the right to be a non-violent resister in war time by being it then and thereafter; and if he does so wisely and understandingly, in concert with others, he will find himself useful.

Such ideas as this may well raise the query, is not non-violent resistance an evasion of duty to the State and one's community? Is it not irresponsible, anti-social, lawless, disloyal, seditious, traitorous, treacherous, anarchistic and revolutionary? Would it not, because of its failure to recognize the tendencies of crowd psychology, work out as an incitement to violence against constituted authority? And perhaps some whose conservatism is so strong as to brush aside technical distinctions would add—Socialistic! Communistic! Bolshevistic! Poisonous Heresy! Threatening the very security of Civilization!

These are grave questions and deserve thoughtful consideration. But as this chapter is already long, we will reserve the discussion of the relation between non-violent resistance and the State to a separate chapter on 'The Political Implications of Non-Violent Resistance.' We mention these points here simply in order

to assure the reader in whose mind the query may naturally have arisen that they will not be overlooked or treated lightly.

But violence makes strange bed-fellows. It numbers among its adherents not only the staunch constitutionalists, conservatives, die-hards, "100 per cent. patriots," and tories, but also the ardent revolutionists, Communists, Bolsheviks and some anarchists. These latter also have some charges against non-violent resistance. They call it counter-revolutionary, bourgeois ideology, opportunism, economic suicide, chloroform of the conscience in relation to exploitation, "using ikons against cannons," contemptible, etc. These charges also deserve careful and full consideration. We are reserving them for two subsequent chapters, one on the 'Economic Implications of Non-Violent Resistance and the other on 'Some Authorities for violence'. In the latter of these we will consider the position and arguments of Lenin and Trotsky in this matter.

Is non-violent resistance only for use by intellectuals, saints, ascetics, religiously minded people, goody-goodys, or vegetarians? Is it adapted only to Oriental psychology and modes of think-

ing, feeling, acting and living? Not at all. Its record shows equally successful use by illiterate peasants and city-bred intellectuals, by saints and the ordinary run of mankind; by rich men and poor, property owners and homeless vagabonds; by meat eaters and vegetarians, Europeans, Americans, Negroes, Chinese and Indians, by religiously minded and those not so accounted. It has been used successfully in political, economic, and social conflicts. It has been used by individuals and by groups, both large and small.

Mr. Gandhi would say that at least the leaders must be religiously minded people. Probably most generals and great military commanders have been religious. Yet it may well be that an apparently irreligious man, such as Lenin, who nevertheless had utter devotion and passion for the welfare of the common people, would probably make an excellent leader of non-violent resisters, if he once came to understand and believe in the method. On this matter of religion the agnostic or atheist would probably be wise not to be dogmatic and deny the existence of certain human forces just because others who realize them and have used them call them by names which are

outside his range of belief—such names, for instance as ‘intuitive’ or ‘spiritual.’ That would be as mistaken as for a scientist of seventy-five years ago to deny the existence of radio waves or X-rays or the possibility of flying. Some one who is a keener observer than he may come along and alter the habits of millions of people while he is busy being dogmatic. Facts and understanding are more important than any particular fashion or style of names.

Those who raise the question whether non-violent resistance is not the result of taking too literally what they call “the hyperboles of the Sermon on the Mount” are referred to the chapter on ‘Some Apparently Ambiguous Authorities.’

Would it not invite or encourage predaciousness and aggression? Mere non-violence or passive acceptance of evil would probably have that result, but there is a steady effective power in non-violent resistance when properly exercised which makes the aggressor, after one or two experiences, quite cautious. This is true despite the slaughters by Jenghis Khan, Tamerlane, Nebuchadnezzar, the Roman emperors, Attila, the Finnish, Russian and Hungarian White Guards, the Russian Reds in Georgia, and all the

others. Whenever faced with disciplined non-violent mass resistance, the governments and great conquerors have failed.

True non-violent resisters are not mere talkers, theorists, "heroes of the phrase," orators, academics. They are men of action, practical politicians, leaders of great causes, defenders of the oppressed, with both feet on the ground and heads in the air where they are meant to be, solid realists.

Some have accused them of maintaining an arrogant air of moral superiority, of thinking of themselves as visionaries and of soldiers as brutalized and degraded; that non-violent resistance is a philosophy of correct deportment, a counsel of perfection, an attitude of inner rectitude, a proud chastity, a cold purity.¹

If any non-violent resisters have assumed such an attitude they have been false to the truth and to the real meaning of their position and enterprise. They can never expect their method to succeed if they do not, in all humility and respect, accord complete freedom to others

1. See R. B. Perry—*The Free man and the Soldier*—pp. 97 *et seq.* above cited. Also Arthur O. Lovejoy—*To Conscientious Objectors*—New Republic, June 16, 1917, p. 187, New York.

who believe differently from themselves. If they do not respect the sincerity and conscience of the soldier, or act as if he had none, they are thereby abandoning all hope of winning him over to their way of belief and action. They must truly respect as well as love their opponents' true selves, however mistaken they may believe them to be.

But no matter what mistakes some followers of non-violent resistance have made, the thing itself is no cold purity or attitude of inner rectitude, any more than any sincere belief or striving for an ideal. Is that not clear from all that has now been said ?

Some objector will pose the question, "What would a non-violent resister do if an enemy or some sort of villain attempted to assault his wife, daughter, mother or sister?" This question and others in relation to private civil life will be carefully considered in a subsequent chapter on Non-violence in Individual Relationships.

Another will inquire whether the method is not insincere and hypocritical because it presupposes loving one's enemy and therefore everyone, and that is humanly impossible. This has been

already touched upon in part in chapter III, and will be more fully considered in the chapters on 'Philosophic and Spiritual Implications.'

Nietzsche's strictures will be considered in the chapter on 'Some Authorities for Violence.'

Ernest Toller has for the central idea of his drama *Man and the Masses* (Masse-Mensch)¹ the apparent contradiction, "If you use violence, you incur guilt; if you do not use violence, you are destroyed by those who use it." In chapter VI, I endeavoured to show that if you do not use violence and yet do use *disciplined* mass moral resistance, you are not so apt to be destroyed as if you had used violence, and in that chapter and this I have tried to show that even if you are destroyed your ideal goes marching on with such greater strength than if you had used violence. The reasons for this will be still more apparent, I think, as other aspects of the matter are discussed herein.

1. Translated by L. Untermeyer, Doubleday, Page & Co. New York, 1924.

IX

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

IT is fairly widely recognised now that war is merely the final flower of many different processes of life.¹ It is

1. See Salvador de Madariaga—*Disarmament*—p. 58—Coward—McCann, Inc. New York, 1929. Also London.

G. W. Crile—*A Mechanistic View of War and Peace*, p. 95-97, Macmillan, New York, 1915.

W. M. Urban—*Is Mankind Worthy of Peace*—27 Int. J. of Ethics, 293 at 302.

Col. J. F. C. Fuller—*The Reformation of War*—p. 69, previously cited.

Admiral A. T. Mahan—*Armaments and Arbitration*—Harper & Bros., New York and London, 1912, pp. 110, 113.

G. R. Stirling-Taylor—*Some Anti-Militarist Fallacies*—The Nineteenth Century, London, May, 1923.

Wm. James—*The Moral Equivalent of War* in his *Memories and Studies*—Longmans Green, London and New York, 1911.

John Gunther—*The High Cost of Hoodlums*—Harpers Magazine, Oct. 1929, New York.

P. G. Duffy—*War and the Christian Ethic*—27 Int. J. of Ethics 217.

swifter, more intense, franker, more dramatic and openly violent, and therefore more patently terrible than so-called "peace," but really the fundamental assumptions and attitudes toward people and life are the same in both our style of peace and war. War is the crisis of our kind of peace. As de Madariaga says, "Strictly speaking, we are permanently at war." Von Clausewitz defined war as the extreme form of human competition. According to John Dewey¹, it is "a function of social institutions."

Although the causes of war are certain assumptions, valuations and attitudes deeper, in a sense, I think, even than the material basis of existence, nevertheless one of the modes in which those deeper factors operate is economic.

W. Trotter—*Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*—ed. of 1922, p. 239, Fisher Unwin, London.

D. L. Sturzo—*The Modern Conscience and the Right of War*, 25 Hibbert Journal, 583, July 1927.

G. G. Coulton—*Democracy and Compulsory Service*, 15 Hibbert J. 204 at pp. 210-211; G. W. K. Tarpey—*The Ethics of Intercourse*—17 Hibbert J. 391; R. M. Eaton—*Social Unrest and the Soldier*—31 Int. J. of Ethics 279; N. Lenin—*The State and Revolution*—published by the Socialist Labour Party of Great Britain and the Marxian Educational Society, Detroit, U. S. A.; T. Veblen—*Theory of Business Enterprise*—Scribners, New York, 1915; *Ibid*—*The Nature of Peace*, Macmillan, New York, 1917.

I. John Dewey—*Human Nature and Conduct*—p. 115—Henry Holt & Co. New York. 1922.

Economic insecurity, actual or threatened, is today one of the most important casual factors of war and of many lesser quarrels. Economic security for every nation, and probably indeed for every individual, is a precondition of true peace. A real peace means no class wars as well as no international wars.

There are no cheap and easy solutions for this difficulty, no potent remedies to offer. But is there no light on the problem?

The financiers, business men and economists are all emphatic in telling us that the Sermon on the Mount simply will not work in these modern days. They say it may have sounded plausible to simple Syrian peasants 1900 odd years ago, but common sense nowadays tells you no, no, immediately. Even the philosophers and ministers ruefully agree. What can the poor non-violent resister do against all this solid wall of cold, hard facts? If he is honest, must he not qualify and whittle down his doctrine to a mere thread, ornamental perhaps for afternoon tea, but not useful? Are not his hopes and thoughts silly?

Let us see what constitutes economic security. Strange as it may seem, the real source of economic security and

power is sunshine. All physical power is derived ultimately from the sun. Coal and petroleum are, in effect, reservoirs from the stream of solar energy of past ages, converted and stored up by vegetation. Water power comes from the action of sunshine evaporating water from the oceans and transporting it in the form of clouds and rain to the land and rivers. Even the mechanical energy of horses and cattle and man himself comes from food obtained from plants activated by sunshine. The plankton which supports the ocean fish, grows by reason of sunshine. All the power used in modern industry and in the economic activities of man in past ages came from his using some part of the never-ending stream of solar energy.¹ The economic security of mankind depends on our ability to use solar energy, past or present. Matter itself is a form of energy, according to modern physics.

Most of the power used in modern commerce and industry comes in the form of coal or oil and a small fraction from waterfalls and artificial reservoirs. One of the great reasons for the present prosperity and financial power of the United

1. See James Fairgrieve—*Geography and World Power*, University of London Press, 1924.

States is the fact that it is using more coal and oil and water power per capita than any other nation in the world. As Henry Ford remarks, this is not primarily a machine age, but a power age. The machine is merely a means of utilizing more power.

The most significant element in all this seems to have been overlooked by our economic leaders. It lies in the tremendous excess of the current income of solar energy over the amount stored up in coal and oil. The scientists seem now to be hinting that at this point we have made a mistake and been misled by the Industrial Revolutionists. Let us see.

The article on "The Sun" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.) states that the units of solar energy received per minute per square centimeter at the earth's mean distance from the sun amount to 2.1 calories, or at the rate of 1.47 kilowatts per square meter, or 1.70 horse power per square yard. More recent researches in astrophysics¹ modify these figures and indicate that only about 0.6

1. Cf. W. J. Humphries—*Physics of the Air*—McGraw Hill, 1929; reports of the Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D. C., and Publications of U. S. Weather Bureau, especially the researches of Abbott, Kimball, Humphreys and Bigelow. Also 14th ed. (1929) of *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Article on *Sun*.

horse power per square yard, on the average, actually reaches the earth's surface.

How does this apply to the problem of national economic security?

Let us take a nation which is considered peculiarly dependent upon the rest of the world for its food and much of its raw material—Great Britain. It is the classic example of a nation which has relied chiefly on its own manufacturing industry and has thereby obtained much power and financial wealth. It is the best instance of a nation which feels compelled to have a large navy for its very existence. Let us indulge in some simple arithmetical applications of our new-found knowledge.

In England, Scotland and Wales together there are, according to the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 56,395,979 acres, excluding lakes and rivers. In each acre there are 4,840 square yards. Multiplying these numbers we get the total area of England, Scotland and Wales, in square yards as 272,961,378,360. Drop off half this area for the use of cities, roads and other buildings, and for bare rock areas. This would leave 136,480,689,180 square yards upon which some sort of trees, shrubs or vegetation might grow. At the rate of 0.6 horse power of solar energy

per square yard, this gives us 81,888,413,508 horse-power of solar energy falling on half the surface of Great Britain.

Various researches¹ have shown that plants are able to transform and use only a small percentage of the solar energy received by them. The different experiments gave figures ranging from 0.6% to 7.4%. Let us take 2% as a conservative figure, for the amount is still unsettled. Two per cent. of the above quantity would be 1,637,768,270 horse-power actually available for agriculture and forestry on half the area of Great Britain.

Objection may be made that the actual arable area of Great Britain is much smaller than half the total area. But I am not talking about conditions under present land laws and farming and forestry practice in that country. I am talking about the energy available if the people really were determined to get it and use it. Without intending for a moment to disparage modern agriculture in any country, it is certain that our knowledge of possibilities in that field is still rudimentary, and also that even now there are possibilities of

1. See Walter Stiles—*Photosynthesis*—Longmans Green, 1925; J. C. Bose—*Physiology of Photosynthesis*—Ibid, 1924; H. A. Spoehr—*Photosynthesis*—Chemical Catalog. Co. Inc., New York. 1926.

horticulture, of terrace farming on hillsides, of root and tuber production, of soil improvement, of intensive farming, of growing plants in water which are wholly neglected¹. There are vast untouched possibilities of intensive fish culture in artificial lagoons along the coast.

I am not presuming to give any advice, or assuming any vast shifts of population in any country. I am merely estimating possibilities, on the assumption that if the people of Great Britain really wanted to, they could change their organization, education and mode of life as much as Japan and Germany did when they made their decisions some years ago. I am assuming that much of the English and Scotch land which was productive before the enclosures could once more be made so.² I am assuming that the boring

1. See J. R. Smith—*Tree Crops*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1929; Milton Whitney—*Soil and Civilization*—Van Nostrand Co., New York, 1925; F. H. King—*Farmers of Forty Centuries*—Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927; O. F. Cook—*Staircase Farms of the Ancients*—National Geographic Magazine for May, 1915, Washington, D. C.; E. A. Rout—*Native Diet*—Heinemann, London, 1926; A. B. Ross—*Big Crops from Little Gardens*—Minton Balch & Co., New York, 1925; studies at Rothamstead in regard to artificial manufacture of manure from straw and other unused vegetation; and studies on plant nutrition at the University of California.

2. Cf. Frank Geary—*Land Tenure and Unemployment*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1925.

of deep wells would* produce water in many areas now considered too dry. I am assuming that with the modern methods developed at Rothamstead, much land could actually be made fertile. I am assuming the intensive and widespread use of modern knowledge of tree crops for human and animal food, of plant breeding, ecology, entomology, etc. I am assuming that British finance could, if it so pleased, back agriculture as strongly and continuously as it has done with industry since the early eighteenth-centuries. I am assuming that if they cared to, the British people could improve on the agricultural education of Denmark and the United States. I am assuming that British inventive genius and science could make vast strides in agriculture if it had the financial backing, social prestige and honour that could be turned into it if the country believed it worth while.

Englishmen would reply, no doubt, that this is pure theory, and point to the fact that British agriculture was unable to make very great increases in production during the Great War, at a time when Great Britain was desperately in earnest. One answer to that is that during the Great War, the mind of Great

Britain was so desperately busy with purely military and naval problems that agricultural improvement could not get much attention. Changes in agricultural methods take more education and time than was available then.

Aside from matters of marketing and transportation, the problem of feeding a population depends partly on the acreage devoted to farming and partly on the efficiency of farming methods. Nobody can deny the statistics of the decline of the area devoted to agriculture in Great Britain.¹ The decline has continued since the war. And although British agriculture is very efficient, it is not as efficient as some others. For instance, the International Yearbook of Agricultural Statistics for 1926-27² shows that in 1926 the yield of wheat in Great Britain and North Ireland (measured in quintals per hectare) was exceeded by four other countries of northern Europe and by New Zealand; that the British efficiency of production of oats, measured similarly, was exceeded by four other northern European nations; in rye, by six other European countries; in barley, by six

1. See Frank Gerry—*Land Tenure and Unemployment*—Allen and Unwin, London, 1925.

2. International Institute of Agriculture, Rome 1927. This was the most recent copy to which I had access.

other European countries and by Chili ; in potatoes, by four other European countries ; and in sugar beets by thirteen other European countries and by Canada and the United States. Substantially these differences have prevailed over a period of years. Furthermore, Danish cows, on the average, yield more milk and better fat per year than those of Great Britain, and in 1914 both Holland and Switzerland exceeded the United Kingdom in this respect.¹ Also there are more pigs raised per acre on the Danish farms than on British farms.²

These figures are not cited in order to disparage British agriculture in the slightest, but merely in order to show that the possibility of improvement is not theoretical, but one of actual existent farm practice in other countries. Yet there are possibilities of improvement still beyond what is now in practice on a commercial scale anywhere.

To see whether some such fundamental changes might be financially

1. See *British Farmers in Denmark*—by J. R. Bond and others, pp. 20, 23, 24, Ernest Benn, London, 1928 ; also *A Handbook of Dairy Statistics* by T. R. Pirtle, Dairy Division of Bureau of Animal Industry, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 1922.

2. See also *Land Tenure and Unemployment*, pp. 175 ff., cited above.

worth while, let us consider the statistics of British industrial physical power, upon which British finance has staked its hopes.

According to the article on Coal and Coal Mining in the 14th edition (1929) of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the latest British census of production shows that the total capacity of all engines in Great Britain, i.e., steam reciprocating, steam turbine, internal combustion, water power and other power in use (excluding the horse-power used in blast furnaces and gas works) is 10,024,996 horse power. Of this 91.2 per cent. is in steam engines. Let us assume that all those steam engines were driven from coal-fired boilers. That would give the total industrial coal-produced energy of Great Britain as 9,142,796 horse power.

Compare that with the estimated solar power available for agriculture, 1,637,796,270 horse power from the sun against 9,142,796 from coal—over 179 times greater. Even allowing for cloudy days, great inefficiencies, losses and wastes in the transformation and utilization of solar power in agriculture and forestry, there is an enormous preponderance in favor of direct solar power. And this takes no account of the vast amount of

solar energy which is constantly being brought to the British Isles by the warmth of the Gulf Stream. Even on cloudy days and in the winter much solar energy reaches the land.

If the comparison were made between these two sources of energy (coal and sunshine) in the United States, Germany, France or almost any other country, with the possible exception of Belgium, the contrast would be much greater in favor of sunshine.

In view of this and other bits of scientific knowledge, does it not look as if perhaps the financiers in most countries are putting their money on the wrong horse? Is not agriculture (sunshine) a better bet than industry (coal) after all?

Would it not be conceivable that British finance could lighten its support of industry and foreign investments and instead back home agriculture; that the Government could develop farms instead of instruments of war? Would not Britain then be far more secure in its food and clothing supply? Would not other nations then feel less threatened, and therefore become less threatening? Would not Britain's need for a navy and army greatly lessen? Would not the same

be true of every nation which tried so to do? Consider Denmark, for instance. If this be true of Great Britain, then the United States, for example, has not the slightest excuse for a large navy or army. She should have the smallest of any nation.

At present the industrial countries are, in effect, living partly off the sunshine of lands other than their own. This is peculiarly true of Great Britain. As she started first with the industrial revolution, she has attained the greatest disproportion between agriculture and industry. In effect Great Britain is buying tropical sunshine, and a considerable part of the price is her taxation to maintain a big navy to keep her control of and connection with that sunshine. Another part of the price is the debt for past wars, mostly incurred for the same reason. The rest of the price is her own coal, or stored sunshine, which she exports and also uses to make manufactured goods for export. The United States and other countries in the Western hemisphere have adopted the same policy.

There is a strong query whether the price is not too high. Is it necessary or even worth while to go to war in order

to gain the results of someone else's sunshine when such a lot of it is to be had at home? Is it wise to use up so rapidly one's reserves of stored sunshine in order to buy the sunshine of other countries? Does that add to one's economic and military security in the long run, or from the point of view of grand strategy or national policy? Might it not be wiser to live on one's annual income of solar energy rather than rapidly to spend the capital stored solar energy (coal)?

If sufficient scientific research were applied to the problem, it is possible that we might discover ways of transforming and using solar power more efficient than that of plants. The recent achievements in producing oil from coal and in low temperature distillation of coal indicate the probability of success with transformations of solar energy if men were to try hard. For the last 150 years man has been having his fun with his new-found sources of physical power and wealth. Is it not time to look ahead a bit and settle down to a wiser policy? One scientist puts it thus:—¹

1. H. A. Spoehr—*Photosynthesis and the Possible Use of Solar Energy*—Annual Report of Smithsonian Institution, 1922, Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

"The embryo of a seed, during its first days after sprouting, lives upon material stored for it by the parent, until it gains strength and becomes an independent plant. Throughout nature the young are matured and protected until they can care for themselves. So man has had his great patrimony of fuel to help him in his first faltering step to dominion over his environment. As he grows in intellectual stature, he must meet the problem of physical necessity, a problem of energy pure and simple, ere he can aspire to true independence. The great contribution of the nineteenth century was the establishment of the doctrines of energy. To the twentieth falls the task of freeing us from our economic placenta."

If we were to attempt to do this we would still need steel, iron, cement, machinery and chemical products for the various processes. But that would seem to be a wiser and less expensive policy than building battleships and forts in order to control so much tropical sunshine. The nations having coal and metal within their borders would then have the honorable function of making machines or chemical or electrical appliances for capturing solar energy and in exchange for these machines, purchasing from other nations their products of solar energy. Thus, the purchasing power of all populations would be increased.

I am not expecting that any of the

industrial nations will change their policy in the near future. I do not mean to imply that we should abandon industry and all become farmers. That would not be necessary or wise. But I do believe that certain financial and controlling groups in almost all countries are now interfering with the most efficient and widespread utilization of solar energy by the people, and that sooner or later such interference will have to stop. Certain forms of selfishness produce inefficient engineering. It seems very doubtful whether any nation has the right to refuse to change its habits of social or economic structure or even its non-essential food habits if making the change would avoid plunging the world into modern war. I believe that we should seek a wiser balance between our utilizations of direct solar energy and of stored solar energy (coal). It seems that the preponderance should be of current solar energy income. Peace lies along that road.

All that I mean by the foregoing little calculation is to indicate that economic security can be obtained by each nation from the solar energy received within its own national boundaries, without going to war or having any

foreign possessions, if it is willing to use thoroughly and whole-heartedly the knowledge which science has brought to the world. War is not an economic necessity. It is not true that any nation *must* have a big navy or a big army. That is true only so long as a nation insists on living off the sunshine of other nations. We need not fight other nations. We need not fight even the forces of Nature. We should make an alliance with Nature. All we need to fight is our own ignorance of the forces of Nature, and our preconceived ideas and pride and inertia. The Sermon on the Mount *can* work for nations, because it is based on solid economic reality.

Hence no non-violent resister or conscientious objector need feel that his faith is devoid of solid economic basis. If sufficient people want to do it, they can go his way without starving. Indeed, if a whole nation did it whole-heartedly and persistently, it would probably become very comfortably well off, with a higher standard of living for all.

But will this work for the individual? Well, let us apply the figures of 0.6 horse power of solar energy per square yard, and 2% efficiency of conversion by plants, to a little 10 acre farm (48,400 sq. yds.).

We find that its proprietor is really in charge of a solar power plant with an average flow of 580 horse power available for agriculture, assuming adequate and regular water supply. His job is to convert that into material useful to mankind, and so wealth.

I don't say that land laws, transportation costs, market practices and other difficulties will actually permit him to produce and sell that much wealth steadily. All I say is that if he and all the other farmers and other people are determined to get it, the wealth is there waiting for them. "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars (or sun), but in ourselves, that we are underlings." Perhaps non-violent resistance could enable him to get out of the class of underlings.

Even for people who are not farmers and have no land, this concept of a constant enormous flow or income of solar energy suggests that there are vast resources of the materials of living and economic security for every single person. It removes the feeling that there is only a limited amount of stuff in the world and that each person must scramble and fight to get his share. It tends to help us see that our struggle is not with other

people but with our own ignorance of the means whereby we can each make use of this never-ending stream of energy. This change of outlook tends to lighten or remove much of the vague forebodings and anxieties that are the background of so many lives. We may be having great hardships and struggles now to make a living, but this helps to give us hope for the future and points the direction for our efforts.

Since there is all this steady continual flow of solar energy, and since one person cannot eat more than one stomachful at a time, nor have more than a limited amount of clothing and houses, need we be frightened and terribly angry if some one steals some of it from us? Will there not be some more presently? Need we shoot the thief? Why not use non-violent resistance to the thief? That is probably a more efficient way to get back the property and prevent further stealing in future. Why worry so hard and so steadily about the future?

In saying this I am not disregarding the toiling and starving millions of people in many parts of the world. But the starvation of many of them, as in China at present, has been largely caused by wars to which they were a party, that

is, by failure to use non-violent resistance. And much of it, so far as it is caused by exploitation of ruling groups, whether foreign or domestic, could be soon ended by well disciplined non-violent resistance and economic boycott. And to the extent that the starvation is caused by ignorance of Nature's laws, that can be remedied by the creative intelligence of leaders acting in the spirit of non-violent resistance. The same is true of the hardships caused by lack of capital and appliances. All can be created provided there is the will and faith.

Once it might have been true that the more A had of material goods, the less there was left for X, Y and Z. But the advance of modern science has rendered that no longer true as a necessary generalisation, no matter if it is still true in certain areas.¹ With science and the right attitude toward property and our fellow men, however, it would not be true to say that the more security one has, the less others have.

It would seem, then, that non-violent resistance does not spell economic suicide. It can put an end to economic

1, See *Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, by Frederic Soddy, M.A., F.R.S., Chaps. I and II, Allen and Unwin, London, 1926.

exploitation, and properly utilized solar power will soon repair the losses.

So much for the economic assurance of the practicability of non-violent resistance. Now for some further applications of the solar energy idea to specific economic problems.

Consider the problem of unemployment, whether it is caused by industrial or financial depression, a strike or a lockout, whether it is part-time or total, seasonal or otherwise. Though it may seem absurd to "industrial" minds, I am sure that the best form of relief is largely individual and not by State action. Each unemployed person is eating food, that is, supplying himself with energy derived from the sun. While idle, he is like an engine running idle. He must put that energy into productive work and make useful goods. Those useful goods should be for the most part prime necessities.

Coal miners on strike start backyard gardens and raise their own food. Most city workers cannot do this. Another necessity is clothing. Almost every room has space for a spinning wheel for flax or wool. Men can spin as well as women, if they will get rid of nonsensical pride and false ideas as to division of labour

between the sexes. The art is easily and rapidly learned. Wool can be spun on a simple distaff costing not over six pence or ten cents—slowly it is true, but not too slow to be practical. The product of many wheels can be woven on a few hand looms—perhaps one weaver to every twenty families. Trade unions can purchase wheels and looms and rent or sell them to families on long-time credit. Thus cloth can be produced not only for family wear but also for sale. Arrangements can be made with tailoring unions for making up suits, or the wives of idle men can perhaps club together and work under the guidance of a skilled seamstress. That is far better than begging or relying wholly on government doles. If the men were on strike, such work would greatly strengthen their position both economically and morally in their own eyes and in the eyes of the public. This could also be done during the idle time of farmers. Idle men cannot borrow much money and dare not put themselves into the control of others by so doing. They must create wealth out of their own resources, be dependent on themselves alone. This means very simple appliances and little space. Hand manufacture of clothing seems by far the best solution of this, though, of course, there are others.

The very simplicity of it will cause derision, but it is true nevertheless.

The idea that coal is really stored sunshine suggests a fundamental unity of function of industrial workers and farmers. They are both tending machines for transforming solar energy into useful materials. Plants and trees are energy transformers tended by the farmer. Boilers, engines and machines are energy transformers tended by the industrial workers. Both are engineers. Their interests thus appear to be harmonious. With this idea we may possibly get rid of some of the discord between cities and rural regions.

The solar power concept connects interestingly with the emphasis which the single-taxers place on land as an economic factor. Land is indeed the place where the vast amounts of solar energy are received, the source of all material wealth. This suggests the extreme importance of the entire revision of land laws so as to permit the utmost opportunity to utilize solar power with the smallest possible financial burden. Moreover, it means that since farming is a transformation of solar energy, and that energy is measured as so much per

unit of area on the earth, agricultural efficiency of production ought to be measured as so much *per acre* rather than so much *per worker*. Measured in this way the small-scale intensive farming of the orient and of European peasants seems to be more efficient in general method than Western large scale farming by machinery. Also if done rightly it tends to reduce unemployment. To measure efficiency too much in terms of money cost or man-hours may be a mistake. Again, since, under our Western system of ownership, a man will work harder and take more care of his own land than of land which he is only able to rent for a short term of years, we see that tenant farming is wasteful of solar energy. If financiers cared a little less for money and a little more about the efficiency of production of their country (in regard to which they assert they are so patriotic) then they would encourage small holdings in permanent ownership. The efficiency of solar power transformation obtainable on small farms owned or held in secure tenure by the farmer and worked intensively may perhaps account in part for the economic stability of France and for the amazing vitality and endurance of the peasant civilizations of India and China.

These considerations indicate a great economic mistake involved in colonial empires. It is recognized now in Europe and America that diversified farming creates economic prosperity and stability for the farmer and reduces the likelihood of plant disease, insect pests, market gluts, and other risks. It also increases the yield per acre. Yet at the same time Europe and the United States are asking and compelling the tropics to develop large plantations and single crop agriculture, to raise in this way rubber, jute cotton, hemp, sugar, tobacco, tea, coffee, rice, oil seeds, cocoanuts, bananas, oranges, pineapple, etc. By this "mining" of the land, the white man is passing a heavy burden onto the tropics, reducing their prosperity, depleting their soil, decreasing their productivity, increasing their losses from plant disease and insects, and market depressions.¹ In the long run it has and will decrease the purchasing power of the tropical markets for manufactured goods. Tropical peoples will be apt to try to get rid of the incubus.

Modern industrial leaders are beginning to realize that certain kinds of

1. See *Diversification of Crops* by C. Y. Shepard, Vol. 2, Tropical Agriculture, No. 5.

exploitation of workers, such as dark, dangerous and insanitary factories, no recreation, long hours, low wages, and poor housing, are financially bad policy. Some day, they will learn that exploitation of the tropics does not pay either. Perhaps non-violent resistance will be one of the media of their instruction.

Some observers say that the present civilization and culture of the temperate zones is now largely based on tropical products, such as rubber, cotton, jute, vegetable oils, coffee, tea, tobacco, spices, etc., and that the tropics must do their share of maintaining the other civilizations. Other observers point to the restless energy of inhabitants of the temperate zones and the relative lethargy of tropical peoples, and do not see, therefore, how exploitation of the tropics could be prevented even if it were desirable on other grounds. Still others believe that industrial nations ought to exploit the tropics in order to spread the economic blessings of industrialism over all the human race.

All these beliefs proceed on a denial of choice or preference to the tropical peoples, and are therefore a form of violence. Hitherto those peoples have lacked an effective way to express their

preferences, but they are beginning to learn the use of the economic boycott and more advanced forms of non-violent resistance. With a proper development of the use of solar power, there will be plenty of outlet at home for the energy of the people of temperate climes. It is all very well to talk of the economic interdependence of the different nations, but to use that as a high-sounding excuse for the sort of exploitation that is now going on will not do. International trade is excellent, but in my opinion, every nation can and ought to produce out of its own solar power its own essential food and clothing, the bare necessities of its life as a nation. Beyond and above that let trade proceed as merrily as it can, but with a minimum of exploitation. And let each nation and each group within the nation use non-violent resistance to keep that minimum low and to educate the holders of power to make social use of it, and to keep them in that path.

Many people agree with Spengler that peasants are tame, dull, stupid, anchored people.¹ Spengler calls them "formless," and exalts the "form," alertness, and interest of city life. But in the light of the solar power concept this

1 Spengler—*Decline of the West*.

would seem to be an untenable generalization. Peasants are really engineers of solar energy, in charge of vast sources of power and wealth. Their farms are power stations full of enormously interesting problems and projects in energetics, chemistry, physics, biology, zoology, plant physiology economics, finance, etc., etc. If the farmers and villagers once become conscious of the meanings involved in their work, the chief centres of interest will cease to be in the cities.

Having thus considered a few of the applications of solar energetics to economic problems which are vexing many people, and causing many conflicts, let us now briefly discuss two or three applications of non-violent resistance to specific cases of economic conflict.

Let us first consider the matter of close financial control of the lives of the mass of people. It is maintained largely through the machinery of financial credit, manipulated by banking groups.

People are right in thinking that credit is exceedingly important. Credit is an amazing energizer. Speaking broadly it is a form of trust, that is to say, a recognition of the unity of man-

kind, at least as between creditor and debtor and in a narrow range. It is a form of expectation or expectancy.

Expectancy is psychologically a very great creative force. From the point of view of labor unions, this mutual trust among employers and bankers is the chief weapon of the capitalists. It enables the capitalist to wait and do without production while the worker is on strike. The worker cannot get long time credit and therefore cannot provide his necessities. So he is starved into submission.

If credit is a sort of recognition of human unity, it ought not to be in the control of only a small group of people, the bankers. It ought not to be confused with money, the medium of exchange. Every group of men with common interests should arrange a machinery of material credit not subject to outside control and manipulation. Thus they would be able to supply their needs and create their projects with far less restriction and dominance by the money lenders. The bankers have been the first to symbolize, arithmetize and work out credit (trust) in quantitative form. They have thus developed a very intricate, powerful and subtle machine, and know it and its action and influence very thoroughly.

There seems to be no reason why other groups could not work out other symbols of credit for the use of themselves, whether they be farmers, industrial workers, technicians, professional men, or any combination of them. The co-operatives and credit unions have done a little in this direction, but have used money symbolisms and thereby subjected themselves to bank control. Banking and financial credit was first invented and developed by a small group of merchants—in Europe by the Venetians and Jews, I believe. Might there not be some sort of bills of exchange of goods or of labor, instead of money, also begun by a few people in a small way?

It seems to me that some such project as this may come out of some creative non-violent resistant group. Non-violent resistance works upon an assumption of trust in human nature. It is itself a new form of credit. Thus non-violent resistance may become the means of producing new kinds of "will organizations" as Graham Wallas calls them.

My observation of the large organizations prevalent in America—whether industrial, commercial, financial, political or educational—in contrast with the small and in some ways more

autonomous and more loosely organized economic and social units in India, leads me to wonder whether large-scale rigid organization does not inevitably result in ignorance of important details, certain kinds of moral irresponsibility, psychological strain, frequent injustice, and consequent moral coercion and moral violence.¹ In many aspects small social and economic units seem to function more efficiently and happily. We are still very ignorant about group psychology. Actual tendencies toward decentralization and local autonomy in industrial and social organizations even in the United States are rather surprising.²

Undoubtedly in this modern world, large-scale organizations for many different purposes are inevitable, but there is need for much thinking and experimenting with new and different types and degrees of integration and control. Nowadays financial controls tend to predominate, perhaps because so

1. See Graham Wallas,—*The Great Society and Human Nature in Politics*. Also the testimony of Lord Haldane before the British Coal Industry Commission and the Report of the Commission itself. Also R. H. Tawney—*The Acquisitive Society*, Bell, London, 1926.

2. Cf. Henry Ford's *My Life and Work* and *Today and Tomorrow*.

many human activities and relationships involve trust, and financial credit is a form of trust and has become capable of quantitative statement. The financial form of control, therefore, readily lends itself to long-distance and large-scale operations. But it has grave disadvantages and probably adds to the "soullessness," irresponsibility and tendency toward coercion inherent in largeness of organization. All this has, of course, political as well as economic results and implications which serious thinkers must work out.¹

These doubts as to the human efficiency and value of large organizations are the chief reason why I am not a Socialist. I doubt whether the most just

I. For suggestive ideas as to decentralization and organization, see writings of Graham Wallas, H. J. Laski, the two autobiographical books of Henry Ford, Mr. Justice Brandeis' book on American trusts; R. Mukerjee—*Democracies of the East*, and a paper by D. Brown, Vice-President of General Motors Corporation on *Decentralized Operations and Responsibilities with Co-ordinated Control* before American Management Association, New York, February 1927. Also two papers by Robert B. Wolf, M. E.—*Modern Industry and the Individual*—January and February, 1919 issues of *System*, A. W. Shaw Co. of Chicago, and his paper, *The Creative Workman*—Vol. II of Proceedings of the International Conference of Women Physicians, New York, 1920. Also Report of British Coal Industry Commission; R. H. Tawney—*The Acquisition Society*, above cited. Also G. D. H. Cole—*Social Theory*—Methuen, London, 1920.

and kindly men in the world could operate a vast rigid organization and obtain efficiency and justice in the final result. Human relations cannot safely be so standardized.

Perhaps money controls and money valuations are so unsatisfactory partly because money has now become not only a varying standard of measurement but also a warped, inaccurate, inadequate or ambiguous symbol. It is perhaps a confusion of different orders or levels of abstraction.¹ One reason why we tend to use it in fields of valuation for which it is inadequate or unfitting is because of our modern passion for measurement, derived from the mental atmosphere of science.

If violence is an evitable result of large-scale organization with financial control, it becomes easier to understand the prevalence of strikes in industry. Strikes and economic boycotts are a form of resistance.

Some feel that the economic pressure of a strike or boycott is a form of coercion and therefore a sort of violence in reality. They say it is intended to

1. Cf. Alfred Korzybski, *Time Binding - The General Theory*, Paper One, R. P. Dutton, New York, 1924; Paper Two, Jas. C. Wood, Washington, D. C. 1926.

injure and will injure the opponents and therefore is inconsistent with the attitude of love professed by a non-violent resister. But if the employees and employers are both entangled in an economic machine which is full of mistakes, inefficiencies and violence of attitude, purpose, thought and action, both parties must seek the truth. A truly non-violent strike is a way of seeking truth. It may be that even a strike that is wholly non-violent in both outward form and inner motive on the part of the strikers does involve a certain element of moral coercive education. Therefore, it may not be wholly ideal. But it is probably better than the sort of economic pressure and moral violence that the present economic system imposes upon all parties. Some day we will attain better relationships. A truly non-violent strike in which the strikers try to assume as much as possible of the inevitable suffering on themselves, being as fully responsible as possible, would surely be a vast improvement over most of the modes of economic pressure used nowadays by both parties in industrial conflicts. All struggles for truth involve suffering, and to the extent that our economic machinery is in error there will be suffering for all parties involved in it, no matter what is done.

I am inclined to believe that one reason why so many strikes fail in Western countries is because both employers and employees, capitalists and proletariats, are snared in the same net of ideas and valuations, those of money and of violence. Both sides think of wealth as a fixed quantity to be struggled for, whereas it is really a continual flow of energy in various forms, and the flow is actually so great, if we will only organize our joint life to utilize it, that there will be more than enough to go around and make a bountiful material life for everyone in the world. Both think that violence is the only means for progress.

Yet to be truly successful in the long run, strikes must be, in my judgment, non-violent in conduct, speech, thought and feeling. The amount of conflict in the economic realm is to-day so great that probably labor and farmer organizations will have greater opportunity than all others to develop and use the methods and discipline of non-violent resistance. Already they have partially used it more than any other groups. As their discipline and understanding of it grows, their victories will, I believe, steadily increase.

It is perhaps useful to compare swift killing by violence, as in war, and slow decrease of vitality and ultimate death by under-nutrition or mal-nutrition, as in economic exploitation. (I am not saying that under-nutrition and mal-nutrition do not also occur among the ignorant wealthy. But they very frequently occur among the poor.) The emotional effect upon the two kinds of victims is somewhat different, yet the difference is not of quality but of attenuation. In the case of violent sudden death, the victim's emotions are strong fear, anger or hate. In the other cases, his emotions are more apt to be what we call anxiety, worry, apprehension, dread, depression, grumbling, discontent, bitterness, despair, cynicism, resentment, scorn, occasionally flaring up into anger and hate. The difference in intensity is not enough to change materially the strategy of the resistance. Both call for non-violent resistance.

Before closing the discussion of strikes it would seem pertinent to consider the doctrine of class war as set forth by Marxian Socialists and Communists. But as this chapter is already so long, we will defer this topic to a later chapter.

POLITICAL ASPECTS AND
IMPLICATIONS

ALL careful observers and thinkers recognize that compulsion, intimidation and violence have been and still are a very large and perhaps predominating element in the State, and especially in political government.¹ If any one felt inclined to dispute the scholars on this point, let him examine the figures showing that the expenditures for past and future wars form a very high percentage of the total expenditures of the governments of the majority of nations. The State doubtless has many fine and essential elements in it, but they perhaps do not counter-

1. E.g.—F. Oppenheimer, H. J. Laski, W. E. Hocking, B. Shaw, Mommsen, Spengler, Tolstoi, Veblen, John Dewey, Admiral A. T. Mahan; Sigmund Freud, the great psychologist in his *Reflections on War and Death*, (Trans. by Brill and Kuttner) Moffatt, Yar, New York, 1918.

balance the large part played by force and compulsion.

Many regard this fact with bitterness or anger, but this seems a mistake. It is not because a particular ruling class have made it so, as the Socialists and Communists would have us believe, but because of an inner psychological attitude which prevails through all groups and classes in the so called "civilized" world. Some explanation and references as to this state of affairs are given in our chapters on economic and philosophic aspects of our subject. The Marxians say that political forms and methods are determined entirely by economic forces. We would say that both political and economic processes, at least in relation to violence and coercion, are due to still deeper psychological factors. The amount of coercion and violence in the State is a reflection or resultant of a similar tendency and attitude in all our life and activities, both individual and associative.

The beliefs of the non-violent resister tend to make him feel that a large part of the activities of the State are founded upon a mistake, namely, the idea that fear is the strongest and best sanction for group action and association. He believes that fear is divisive and therefore

cannot be the foundation for permanent unity and strength. His reasons are more fully set forth in the chapter on philosophy. He believes that in the family and in education it has now been realized that fear is not a sound basis for action. There we find substituted the more positive and growth-stimulating forces of intellectual curiosity, wonder and love. The non-violent resister looks forward to a time when a similar realization will come in regard to the larger associations of States. He believes that non-violent resistance will probably be an important means in reaching this realization.

Because of the importance of the factor of compulsion in the State, it will be desirable to examine a number of relationships between the State and other forces or elements, in which violence or non-violence may play a part. By so doing we will come to understand better the meaning and implications of non-violent resistance. We will consider them as follows :—

- A. External relations with other States—diplomacy and war.
- B. Internal relations—State action toward minorities

1. Criminals
2. Conscientious objectors to war
3. Labor organizations
4. Racial minorities
5. Various dissenters such as Communists, anarchists, etc.

Attempts to improve international relations absorb the time, energy and money of many people. While I admire the devotion shown, the most part of it seems to me to be wasted because it deals with results, with symptoms, with surface phenomena, instead of the root of the trouble. It is like putting poultices on a cancer. It may relieve the pain or swelling temporarily, but the disease breaks out again presently. War is an institution, and institutions are external expressions of inner attitudes and ways of thinking.

The great Indian philosopher, Aurobindo Ghose, in his book on *War and Self-Determination*.¹ writes:—

“So long as war does not become psychologically impossible, it will remain, or, if banished for a while, return. War itself, it is hoped, will end war; the expense, the horror, the butchery, the disturbance of tranquil life, the whole confused

I. Publ. by Sarojni Ghose, 93-1A, Bow Bazar St., Calcutta, 1922 p. 10, 11.

sanguinary madness of the thing has reached or will reach such colossal proportions that the human race will fling the monstrosity behind it in weariness and disgust. But weariness and disgust, horror and pity, even the opening of the eyes to reason by the practical facts of the waste of human life and energy and the harm and extravagance are not permanent factors; they last only while the lesson is fresh. Afterwards, there is forgetfulness; human nature recuperates itself and recovers the instincts that were temporarily dominated..... War is no longer, perhaps, a biological necessity, but it is still a psychological necessity; what is within us must manifest itself outside.

".....Only when man has developed not merely a fellow-feeling with all men, but a dominant sense of unity and commonalty, only when he is aware of them not merely as brothers—that is a fragile bond—but as parts of himself, only when he has learned to live, not in his separate personal and communal ego-sense, but in a large universal consciousness, can the phenomenon of war, with whatever weapons, pass out of his life without the possibility of return."

This opinion is in substance echoed by Bertrand Russell, the great philosopher-mathematician of England. He writes :—¹

" The supposed economic causes of war, except in the case of certain capitalistic enterprises, are in the nature of a rationalization ; people wish to fight,

1. *What I Believe*—" The Forum " for September, 1929, New York p. 131.

and they, therefore, persuade themselves that it is to their interest to do so. The important question, then, is the psychological one—'Why do people wish to fight?' And this leads on from war to a host of other questions concerning impulses to cruelty and oppression in general. These questions in their turn involve a study of the origins of malevolent passions, and thence of psycho-analysis and the theory of education.....

"The basis of international anarchy is man's proneness to fear and hatred. This is also the basis of economic disputes; for the love of power, which is at their root, is generally an embodiment of fear."

It is my belief that world courts, leagues of nations, peace pacts and peace congresses do little toward improving the inner attitudes or psychological dispositions and habits of mind. Most of the peacemakers are not only working on superficial externals, but also disregard deep seated inconsistencies and forces working for war in many parts of the economic, social, educational and organized religious systems¹. To say this is not to oppose their effort, but only to wish that it might be more efficient.

1. Cf. Wm. McDougal—*Janus, or the Future of War*—Kegan Paul, London, and E. P. Dutton, New York, 1927. Also Major Sherman Miles—*The Problem of the Pacifist*, 217 North American Review 313, March 1923.

Inasmuch as peacemakers need to be especially sensitive to the truth, it seems desirable to present here two criticisms of their activity, for them to ponder over. One was well phrased by Niebuhr as follows:¹ —

“...The implication is that England and America are the only two really solvent nations in the Western world, and that, since they have what they want and need, it is to their interest to preach peace. The hungry nations will meanwhile fail to react to this moral idealism. They will shrewdly and cynically observe that it is always the tendency of those who have to extol the virtue of peace and order and to place those who have not at a moral disadvantage.

“It is quite impossible for the strong to be redemptive in their relation to the weak if they are not willing to share the weakness of the weak, or at least to equalize in some degree the disproportion of advantages.”

Another incisive criticism is made by Trotsky in respect to a certain sort of pacifism.² He says that

“a responsible function is allotted to pacifism in the economy of warfare.” By

1. Reinhold Niebuhr—*A Critique of Pacifism*—139 Atlantic Monthly 637, May 1927, Boston U. S. A.

2. In his *Democracy, Pacifism and Imperialism*, pp. 196, 197 of *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia* by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky, ed. by L. Fraina—The Communist Press, New York, 1918.

this he refers to the pacifists who go around talking about "our sacred duty to do all in our power to preserve the nation from the horrors of war," yet always carefully adding, "If war should come, we will all support the government, of course." Trotsky proceeds:

" 'To do everything in our power against the war,' means to afford the voice of popular indignation an outlet in the form of harmless demonstration, after having previously given the government a guarantee that it will meet with no serious opposition, in the case of war, from the pacifist faction.

"Official pacifism could have desired nothing better. It could now give satisfactory assurance of imperialistic 'preparedness'. After Bryan's own declaration, only one thing was necessary to dispose of his noisy opposition to war, and that was, simply, to declare war. And Bryan rolled right over into the government camps. And not only the *petite bourgeoisie*, but also the broad masses of the workers, said to themselves: 'If our government, with such an outspoken pacifist as Wilson at the head, declares war, and if even Bryan supports the government in the war, it must be an unavoidable and righteous war.' "

It is easy to see how that type of pacifism helps to rally the entire country to the support of militarists at the time they most need it. They are glad to let such pacifists throw a gentle moral glow over affairs before war and then fill them-

selves and the masses with moral fervour in support of war as soon as it comes. Pacifists will be wise to search their hearts to see if they are in such a moral position. They would be wise to ponder over various other shrewd criticisms of their ideas.¹

On the other hand, I believe that non-violent resistance does and will do much toward causing the required inner psychological change. It tends to remove international fears and suspicions which Roosevelt thought were the ultimate causes of war.²

In Chapters V and VI we tried to show the use of this new weapon in time of war. It can be used internationally, with or without economic boycott as circumstances require. Causes that some people think cannot be submitted to arbitration may be handled by such means. Mere non-violence will not do, as the example of China, in past, shows. There must be constructive resistance. The Indian Non-Co-operation Movement in 1922 gave an example which was not far from success.

1. See *The Soviet Union and Peace*—Martin Lawrence, Ltd. London, 1929.

2. Theodore Roosevelt—*America and the World War*.

De Madariaga argues cogently that international peace requires a development of a world community.¹ I would agree, and believe that the mood of mutual tolerance and good will needed for the establishment and operation of such a community will best be created, in social practice, by the use of non-violent resistance for the righting of existing wrongs.

One weakness of most peace proposals is that they all expect the action to be taken by governments or large organizations, or at least some one else beside the proposer. The advantage of non-violent resistance is that it begins at home and can and needs to be practised in all the small private relations between people as a preparation for and accompaniment of its use on a large scale. Nobody can dodge the responsibility for its success. The poorest and most insignificant can practise it as finely, successfully and usefully as prime ministers, presidents, financiers or other powerful persons. Through non-violent resistance we can reach an active, reasoned belief in peace which is capable of being continuously practised in all grades of life and all sorts of conflict, so as to educate every one into a

1. *Disarmament* p. 42, 45, 48, 56, 61, 198.

conviction that it gives better results, more efficiently than violence.

Let us now consider the internal relationships of the State. .

The group within each State toward which the State uses compulsory force most constantly is that of the criminals. It is, therefore, interesting to find that the attitude and methods of non-violent resistance are the conclusions toward which all the experience of penology and the investigations of psychiatrists, criminologists and social reformers are steadily tending¹.

1. See *English Prisons under Local Government*—by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Longmans Green, London, 1927; *English Prisons. Today—Being a report of the Prison System Enquiry Committee*—edited by S. Hobhouse and A. F. Brockway—Longmans Green, London, 1922; *Penology in the United States*—by L. N. Robinson—J. C. Winston Co., Philadelphia, 1923; *Probation and Delinquency* by E. J. Cooley—Nelson, New York, 1927; T. M. Osborne—*Society and Prisons*—Yale University Press, 1916; *Ibid—Prisons and Common Sense*—1924; G. B. Shaw—*Imprisonment*—Brentano, New York, 1925 (a reprint of his introduction to *English Prisons under Local Government*, supra); Frank Tannenbaum—*Wall Shadows*—Putnams, New York, 1922; Wm. Healy—*The Individual Delinquent* 1915, New York; Donald Lownes—*My Life in Prison*; Al Jennings—*Through the Shadows with O'Henry*; F. R. Johnson—*Probation for Juveniles and Adults*; G. Godwin—*Cain or the Future of Crime*—Kegan Paul, London and E. P. Dutton, New York, 1929; *Handbook of American Prisons*, 1926; Putnams, New York, J. O. Stutzman—*Curing the Criminal*—Macmillan, New York, 1926. Cf.

One of the ablest brief statements of the whole problem is G. B. Shaw's "Imprisonment," cited above. It dodges none of the hard facts, indulges in no sentiment, is very inclusive in its scope, is short, courageous and cogent. He has studied the subject very thoroughly, as a member of the British Prison System Enquiry Committee. His statement is so clear and compact that I cannot forbear quoting two paragraphs from his recapitulation:—

"3. The prison authorities profess three objects: (a) retribution (a euphemism for vengeance), (b) deterrence (a euphemism for terrorism), and (c) reform of the prison. They achieve the first by simple atrocity. They fail in the second through lack of the necessary certainty of detection, prosecution and conviction; partly because their methods are too cruel and mischievous to secure the co-operation of the public; partly because the prosecutor is put to serious inconvenience and loss of time; partly because most people desire to avoid an unquestionable family disgrace

also F. C. Bartlett—*Psychology and the Soldier*—Cambridge University Press, 1927, p. 124. R. N. Baldwin—*Pacifism and the Criminal*—in D. Allen's *Pacifism in the Modern World*, Doubleday Doran, New York; 1929. L.E. Lamez—*Life and Death in Sing Sing*—New York and London, 1929; Clarence Darrow, *Resist Not Evil*—Holdeman—Julius, Girard, Kansas, U.S.A. *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*—ed. by R. N. Baldwin, Vanguard Press, New York, 1927. Several of these contain extensive bibliographies. Note also the reformed prison systems of Soviet Russia and Mexico.

much more than to secure a very questionable justice; and partly because the proportion of avowedly undetected crimes is high enough to hold out reasonable hopes to the criminal that he will never be called to account. The third (Reform) is irreconcilable with the first (Retribution); for the figures of recidivism ¹, and the discovery that the so-called Criminal Type is really a prison type ², prove that the retribution process is one of uncompensated deterioration."

"4. The cardinal vice or the system is the anti-Christian vice of vengeance, or the intentional duplication of malicious injuries partly in pure spite, partly in compliance with the expiatory superstition that two blacks make a white. The criminal accepts this, but claims that punishment absolves him if the injuries are equivalent, and still more if he has the worse of the bargain, as he almost always has. Consequently, when absolution on his release is necessarily denied him, and he is forced back into crime by the refusal to employ him, he feels that he is entitled to revenge this injustice by becoming an enemy of society....."

Shaw also remarks, "The effect of revenge, or retribution from without, is to destroy the conscience of the aggressor instantly."

If there is ever any reform after

1. Criminals returning to jail for a subsequent offense.

2. *i. e.*, Created by the prison environment. See *English Prison Today* edited by Hobhouse and Brockway, Part II, Ch. IV.

forceful punishment or imprisonment, it is not the force or even the suffering that works the change. That depends upon the reaction of the suffering person, and cannot take place unless there is stimulus to some latent or potential goodness in the criminal. Intelligent kindness is a far more effective stimulus than any force can be. If force were the true cause of amendment, then its efficacy would increase with repetition. But all experience shows that a repetition of force merely hardens the prisoner and stimulates a desire for revenge.

Violence and severe punishment have proved unavailing for thousands of years. The facts compel us to admit that cruel punishment is not only ineffective but is injurious to prison wardens and to society as well as to the criminal. Also we now know that society is itself largely responsible for the conditions which create criminals. Curative methods are the only ones which work or can possibly work. This means careful psychiatric or psychological examinations and psychiatric treatment ; remedial diet ;¹ medical care if need be ; training in a useful craft

1. See *Biochemistry and Mental Phenomena* by Joseph Needham, an Appendix in *The Creator Spirit* by C E. Raven, Martin Hopkinson, London, 1927, pp. 296-299.

or occupation; wise general education, good food, good quarters; decent, kindly, respectful treatment; many sorts of stimuli and opportunities for normal expression and living; wise probation; good juvenile and delinquent courts. Shaw and Godwin describe such treatment in detail. The criminal courts should have only the function of deciding whether or not the crime has been committed and the accessory facts. It should have no power of punishment. Thereafter the case should be handled by physicians, psychologists,¹ social workers and employment agencies. The object should be not to make good prisoners but to make the criminals into good citizens.

There are of course many dangerous and probably incurable criminals at present who require close restraint. They are the inevitable product of existing social processes and penal systems. They will not disappear nor will they cease to be manufactured until society itself is changed for the better. Prison reform and criminal reform are a part of social and economic reform.

But when really sound treatment is

1. Perhaps even psychiatry itself needs reform for this purpose. See T. Burrow—*The Social Basis of Consciousness*, previously cited.

given the criminals and when society steps forward in its own reform, the prison population will greatly decrease. Even the feeble minded and insane are capable of great improvement by proper treatment. Sound diet alone has worked wonders in numerous cases.

It is interesting to realize that non-violent resistance can be used both by the State and the prisoners. If the State considers itself the injured party and the criminal the attacker, it can offer him non-violent reformatory treatment though at present such treatment is mostly violent in method and spirit. If the criminal feels that he is really the victim of an unjust social system and brutal wardens, he too may offer non-violent resistance and do his share toward prison reform. In this connection, Gandhi's instructions for the jail conduct of political prisoners are of interest, though we do not have space to quote them here.¹

Like war, the existing terrible state of crime and prisons and treatment of the whole problem is largely a symptom of still deeper faults in society as a whole.

1. See Collection of Gandhi's writings entitled *Young India*, 1919-22, pp. 1116, 1117, 1118, 1120-22, 1125—Ganesan, Madras, also B. W. Huebsch, New York.

We believe that the spirit and method of non-violent resistance applied to the whole of individual and community life will be of the utmost assistance. The reform of criminals is a very interesting example of its possibilities, and a promising field for its development and use.

The police system also needs modification, of course, in the direction of constantly less violence. Certain police functions are necessary in any complex modern society, such as directing traffic in city streets, providing information for strangers, helping to settle altercations without violence, helping lost children, directing large crowds, providing a disciplined orderly nucleus of leaders and helpers in times of public disaster such as fires, floods, earthquakes, severe storms, epidemics of disease, etc. The policeman of the future by his example and leadership in firm, intelligent, strong, creative kindness can do much to educate the masses to non-violence as a part of daily routine life. It is in this direction, one hopes, that police systems will evolve.

CHAPTER XI

POLITICAL ASPECTS AND IMPLICATIONS

(Continued)

IN regard to the relations between the State and conscientious objectors to war, this does not seem to be the place to enter into a long discussion about the relative supremacy of the individual conscience and the State. Those who are still in doubt about that may consult other books.¹ This book assumes the

I. For instance:—W. E. Hocking—*Human Nature and its Remaking*—Yale University Press, 1923; Ibid—*Man and the State*—Ibid, 1926; H. J. Laski—*Authority in the Modern State*—Yale University Press, 1919; Ibid—*A Grammar of Politics*—London, 1927; M. P. Follett—*The New State*—Longmans Green, New York, 1918; Ibid—*Creative Experience*—Ibid, 1924; L. T. Hobhouse—*The Metaphysical Theory of the State*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1918; T. Veblen—*The Nature of Peace*; G. D. H. Cole—*Social Theory*—Methuen, London; Nietzsche Works (consult index thereto); H. D. Thoreau—*Virtue of Civil Disobedience and Life without Principle*; F. Oppenheimer *The State*—Vanguard Press, New York; P. Kropotkin—*The State, Its Historic Role*; J. W. Graham

prevalence of violence in the world and that the State is its chief organized instrumentality. We have endeavored to show many reasons why violence is inefficient, endless and mistaken, and why non-violent resistance is a sounder method. Non-violent resistance is, we believe, no mere dim, uncertain, mystic matter of conscience, although conscience was doubtless the first way this truth was apprehended. Many people who have not yet thought the matter through clearly still apprehend it only vaguely through their conscience.

In order that the opposition may understand a little more clearly why this should be so, let us quote a brief passage from W. E. Hocking's *Human Nature and its Remaking*:—¹

".....For conscience is the principal inner agency for the remaking of human nature; hence it must stand as a critic against everything that is to be remade, and so over against all instincts. . . .

"My own view is that conscience stands outside the instinctive life of man, not as something separate, but as an *awareness of the success or*

—*Conscription and Conscience*—Allen & Unwin, London 1922; N. Thomas—*Is Conscience a Crime?*—Vanguard Press, New York, 1927.

I. Revised ed. pp. 122-123, Yale University Press, 1923.

failure of that life in maintaining its status and its growth. It is a safeguard of the power at any time achieved. It interposes a check when an act is proposed which threatens 'integrity'. What conscience recognizes is that certain behavior increases our hold on reality while certain other behavior diminishes that hold, constitutes what the old Southern Buddhist called an *asava*, a leak. The remark of conscience is : 'That course, or that act, promises to build, or threatens to tear down, what you metaphysically are' . . . (conscience) is not an instinct. It is the latest and finest instrument for the self-integration of instinct."

We believe that the State is imperfect, like all institutions, and that non-violent resistance is a means of perfecting it. We believe that all true patriots and lovers of mankind owe it to each other and to humanity to try to perfect the mode of their association. We believe that if the State is to be considered the outward form and organization of the large principles of human association, those principles are especially endangered in time of threatened or actual war. At such times it is the special duty of believers in non-violent resistance to stand by their principles, and thus try to save the better self of the State.

But inasmuch as war is only the end result of deep, subtle and widespread

mistakes such as we have outlined in part in the chapters on psychology and economics and will set forth more fully in the chapters on philosophy and hygiene, all non-violent resisters should be very careful at all times to go much deeper and wider and more carefully than mere opposition to war. Some possible activities for them will be discussed in another chapter.

But inasmuch as the case of conscientious objectors is in actual time of war very difficult, let us consider it somewhat further. In chapter VIII we considered some of the reproaches that have been hurled at conscientious objectors. There are several others.

It has been argued¹ that the State does not permit its citizens even in time of peace to set up conscience as a defence for acts which are generally disapproved. The courts do not allow men to plead that they are conscientious burglars, conscientious murderers, conscientious polygamists, or conscientious nihilists. No, if they do those things they are punished. Perry says, "If his conscience is offended,

1. R. B. Perry—*The Free man the Soldier*—Scribners, New York, 1916, pp. 36, 37; Major Walter G. Kellogg—*The conscientious Objector*—Boni and Liveright, New York, 1919, p. 122.

so much the worse for his conscience." Therefore, it is said, no mercy should be shown to conscientious objectors in war-time. "They are a danger to the State; compel them to serve or put them away," is the cry.

But in all this and the protest against it by many conscientious objectors and their friends, it seems to me that the real meaning of the action of the conscientious objectors is being missed. They are aiming at something deeper than any constitution or statutory law, something moral of which written law at its best is only a cramped, partial, lifeless, second-hand reflection. They are trying to enlighten and reform a very deep-rooted, strong, old habit and attitude. This cannot be done quickly or easily. It requires much creative thought and feeling. Someone has to pay a big price for such a big change. The conscientious objectors, if they are clear-headed and sincere, must be ready to pay the price without shrinking, whimpering, complaining or self-pity. Only by their ideas, their actions and their voluntary suffering can they persuade mankind to do the necessary hard thinking and altering of habits.

Communists are fond of quoting Carl Marx's saying that "violence is the mid-

wife of a new order of society." But Marx was mistaken here. Not violence, but *suffering* is the midwife of a new order of society. Furthermore, the suffering must be, so far as possible, voluntary on the part of those who propose a new order. The Communists add to Marx's error when they wish to impose the suffering on others. It is true that those who desire a new order are usually those who have already suffered very severely and apparently futilely. But their suffering need not be futile if they will organize and discipline it and think still more clearly. Corporate or mass non-violent resistance will do the work if they are really determined and always seek the truth.

For these reasons the conscientious objectors may welcome imprisonment and persecution gladly, as the occasion when they can do much fruitful work in compelling men to think. In time of war people get in some respects closer to reality. It is, therefore, perhaps a more favorable occasion than one would suspect, for making a profound and lasting impression upon large numbers of people. Also it is a means of strengthening and purifying the energies and thoughts and inner attitude of the conscientious ob-

jectors themselves, thus fitting them to be more useful later. They are paying the price not only of living in the State but of creating new values and re-creating the State.

Someone made the following criticism of conscientious objectors who wished to live as ordinary citizens:—

“To pay taxes is to be as much a partner in the war as fighting would be—with the added enormity of paying others to do an immoral thing which the protester evades by buying himself off.”

But as C. J. Cadoux pointed out,¹

‘To part with one’s property at the demand of another person does not make one responsible for all that person’s doings, nor does it imply a readiness to obey any and every command that that person may feel he has a right to issue.’

A non-violent resister does not have to refuse *all* co-operation with a State unless he feels that the State is entirely evil or that it is past reform. He may select and grade his resistance to its evils according to their nature and the immediate end to be accomplished. He might on some occasion refuse to pay taxes, as Thoreau did, as a means of compelling men to think; but he should

1. *The Early Christian Attitude to War*—Headley Bros., London, 1919.

realize that even then he is still helping to support the State. All his food and clothing is produced or transported by persons or corporations which pay taxes to the Government and charge this expense into the price of their services.

Again, it has been said that

“If a Christian must refuse to fight for his country, he must refuse the protection of his life and property which the law affords him.”

That may or may not be so, but if it is so, the non-violent resister will not be dismayed, for his belief is that his real protection lies not in policemen, courts and laws, but in the prevailing common sense, experience and habits of decency among the mass of mankind, and in the method of non-violent resistance to influence them to kindly action.

But perhaps the militarists and their supporters need not be too perturbed by the opposition of the non-violent resisters, nor need the latter feel that they are in desperate straits. It begins to appear that modern war will soon no longer require vast masses of soldiers and universal conscription. Aeroplanes, gas bombs, tanks and submarines are acting to create military unemployment. Hence, the State will not be under such pressure to conscript every possible man.

The article on *Conscription* in the latest (14th) edition (1929) of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, by the English authority Col. J. F. C. Fuller, reads in part as follows, (referring to the Great War):—

"In spite of tank attacks, air attacks, naval attrition and chemical attacks, it was not realized that weapons give blows and men receive them, and that the main problem in tactics is how to give blows without receiving them, and not a mere mathematical question of human tonnage. . . . As military power was once based on the number of sturdy yeomen and peasants who could be impressed or enlisted, today it depends on the numbers of skilled mechanics, not only to manufacture war machines but to fight them. The advent of the motor-driven battle vehicle has reintroduced armour as an essential in tactical organization. Another armoured age faces the great armies of the world, an age of costly machines in place of cheap muskets, and the tendency is, consequently, one towards small armies in which quality will replace the quantity theory of the present cannon fodder masses.¹

". . . . The theory of conscription has run its course, and is today growing out of date. A few years hence no conscript army will be able to face an organized attack by armed motor cars, let alone by tanks and kindred weapons. It will have its use solely as an army of occupation, a force of men which will

1. In accord see General Von Seackt—*The Army of the Future*—*Revue de Genieve*, 1929, trans. in—*The Living Age*, New York, Nov. 1, 1929.

occupy a conquered area but not conquer it. The fighting armies of the future will be voluntary, highly professional and highly paid, consequently, comparatively small; this is the whole tendency of present day military evolution."

In all countries there are numerous instances of oppressive and unfair court decisions, legislation and administration of laws to the disadvantage of labor and labor organizations. This fact seems to place a burden upon labor organizations to correct such injustice by non-violent resistance. They have done much of this in the past. I am confident that with a clearer understanding of non-violent methods and aims, with better discipline and some other modifications,¹ the labor organizations can accomplish much more to make this a happier and more prosperous world. That they have this task in addition to other hardships need not make them feel bitter. They are better fitted for it than most people of the wealthier classes, because the poor, as a class, have a stronger and clearer sense of human unity than any other group. Only from such a realization can any great reforms in this field come about.

If any conservatives are anxious lest there might be a "tyranny of labor," let

1. See Chapter on Economics.

them remember that they also have the privilege of using non-violent resistance. But the conservatives should be very careful to keep their resistance wholly non-violent even in spirit, and be ready to suffer cheerfully, for they have for many centuries had what physicians call a diathesis or tendency to use violence.

In some instances of sentencing innocent men to long imprisonments and even death, there has been much severe criticism directed against the governors, judges and other officials involved. This seems to me both a misconception of the real forces at work and a great waste of energy. The fault does not lie with the men in office, or indeed with the Government. The real causes are psychological and spiritual, and it is these that must be resisted and transformed. Mistaken inner attitudes and ideas pervade all the relations of life—social, economic, religious, educational, racial, etc. Governments are the external results of inner concepts and attitudes. They are the institutionalized forms of our habitual inner attitudes and ideas. Each one of us is partly responsible. The re-education must be directed primarily at this foundation, though, of course, it should find expression in all situations and relationships.

In many countries there are race problems of great importance. Violence enters into them perhaps more in the United States and in Africa, the Negro being the sufferer in both cases. All through Asia and other countries the white race is treating colored races in ways which are violent in spirit and result, if not in outward form. It would seem that discipline wisely-led, mass non-violent resistance in these instances would do much to remedy these abuses. The Negroes are a gentle race, accustomed to marvelous endurance of suffering. Their gentleness and humility would be towers of strength to them in any campaign of non-violent resistance. This is true of all colored races. Their successful use of mass non-violent resistance would remove much injustice in the world. As a member of the white race, I would welcome such a thing, especially because of the alteration it would create in the inner attitude of my own people. Our pride has weakened us morally so that we as a race cannot escape from our own chains without the help of our colored brothers and sisters.

In Chapter VIII several questions were raised about the apparently radical position in which non-violent resistance

stands in relation to the State. Let us consider these now.

First, non-violent resistance is not an evasion of duty to the State or community. On the contrary, it is an attempt to see that duty in its largest and most permanent and responsible aspect. It is an attempt to place all relations between individual citizens, between groups, and between individuals and groups and the State, and even between States, on the cleanest, finest, most co-operative, most unifying and permanent basis possible. It is creative and conservative of the finest values in human and community relationship. It intends no harm, it refrains from violence or threats of any kind.

Some may think it inconsistent to say that non-violent resistance, which may even employ economic boycott for a time, is a co-operative movement. But careful thought shows that really effective and permanent co-operation must have substantial equality between the parties as a pre-condition and foundation. Often the first part of the effort of non-violent resistance is to establish a recognition of spiritual equality and an expression of it in conduct. Once that is established, real and fine co-operation can proceed apace.

Non-violent resistance is not lawless nor anarchical. Anarchy is absence of government. But the theory of non-violent resistance is not hostile to government as such. It does oppose evils in government, but so would every fine and honest citizen. Otherwise how could there ever be any hope of decent government? But not only does non-violent resistance accept government; but in order to be successful it must itself impose on its followers a rigid discipline and strong co-operation and sense of responsibility.

For the same reason it is not disorderly. It asks for not less order but more, but it asks that the order be more just, more equitable, both in operation and purpose and result, than many of the kinds of order that now prevail. It aims to see that the prevailing order shall be truly democratic, just and fair to all groups, to minorities as well as majorities. A jail is outwardly orderly, but who wants to live in a jail? As Laski says: "There are kinds of order which are closely akin to death." We must not think that there are no new kinds of order under which people can live happy, peaceful and useful lives. There may be a federation of different kinds of political order.

Again, non-violent resistance is not Communistic, by reason of its non-violence.¹

It is not Socialistic, especially not Marxian, for it is not primarily a theory of a specific mode of government. Nor is it based upon the "materialist" interpretation of history.

It is not unconstitutional, outside of dictatorships, anyhow. Political democracy implies government by consent, as the very act of voting indicates. The existence of consent implies a right of dissent and refusal, with a cheerful willingness to pay the price of such action.

It is not treacherous, because it is always open, frank and above-board. It can succeed only by open truth, without secrets, tricks, evasions, omissions of facts, or distortions.

Is it or can it ever be seditious; that is, tending to create disaffection toward or discontent with the government of which the non-violent resister is a citizen? This is a question which calls for careful thought and discrimination.

There are several reasons why this is

I. For other differences, see our chapter on Some Authorities for Violence, in which this aspect of Communism is discussed at some length.

a difficult question. One reason is that, after all, most modern governments owe their very existence to successful sedition and rebellion. Great Britain had her Cromwell; the United States, her George Washington; France grew out of the French Revolution; Germany had her recent revolution, also Italy, Russia, Turkey, China, Mexico, and all the Central and South American countries. This tends to the awkward conclusion that possibly sedition is wicked only when it is unsuccessful.

Again, there is the undoubted fact that affection and contentment, disaffection and discontent, are by-products of conditions, and cannot be stirred up by mere talk, provided the conditions in themselves are really just and right to all parties concerned. Hence, at the most, so called "agitation" could be only an arousing of consciousness and desire for improvement. The only way to cure the disaffection is to remove its real causes, the defective conditions. A parent cannot arouse the love of a child (i.e., remove its disaffection) by punishing or imprisoning it. Submission may be created that way, but not affection. If governments do not want disaffection (sedition), they must create

positive affection in the person in question, and that can be done only by making conditions right. That is, the government can create affection by proving in action that its profession of existing for the benefit of all its citizens is really true.

Of course, some people, so called "cranks," are impossible to satisfy no matter what is done, but there is no harm in letting them blow off steam, for if they are only cranks they will not get any appreciable following. If any considerable permanent following can be obtained by them, it means that there are some really wrong conditions which deserve a remedy and patient attention to the complaints of those who suffer from them.

Trials for sedition have one other awkward feature arising from the position of the judges. Whenever a case comes involving a relative of the judge, or involving a corporation or firm in which the judge as a private citizen has any pecuniary interest, he declines to sit on that case in order to avoid any appearance of possible prejudice. In a case of sedition there is always in the background the question of the morality of the governmental acts which the accused person criticized. The judge is an official

of that government, so there might be a faint aroma of a doubt as to his freedom from bias to try such a case. It is different from cases involving constitutional law, for those cases are more purely legalistic and less in regard to questions of fundamental morality.

Finally, there is the hard moral fact of the actual character of the State as revealed on the record. It can hardly be doubted that the history of the State, more than of any other institution, is full of violence. As it stands before the moral bar of mankind and asks judgment against the conscientious objectors, the State should remember the two old rules of equity, "He who seeks equity must do equity," and "He who seeks equity must come into court with clean hands." There are many who are not generally considered pacifists but who nevertheless feel that in many respects the State has a very faulty record.

Sedition is one kind of opposition to the general will of the nation. But that general will is not a rigid or static thing; it is constantly altering as it faces new conditions and new problems. The general will is made up of a consensus of many ideas and purposes interesting and fermenting together in a process of dis-

cussion and action. Different individuals, parties and groups propound their ideas and try to persuade others to adopt them on a wide enough scale to make it a general will or purpose. A movement of non-violent resistance is merely one of many modes of political persuasion. It is really much older than the initiative, referendum and recall. As it is wholly peaceful in both manner, purpose and result, it is thoroughly healthy. It wins or loses on the merits of its cause and the merits of its methods, without threats or violence or hatred of any sort. It is a method of attempting to reform certain established practices, not by violent or unfair coercion, but by kindly persuasion.¹

True law is created and enforced not by command but by consensus. In actual practice, laws are often nullified either by obsolescence, by local opposition, or by lack of serious legislative intent. Many statutes have been enacted which do not represent the true consensus of opinion. That consensus is always grow-

I. See the statement of Mr. Gandhi before the Hunter Committee—pp. 1 to 45 of *Young India*, 1919-1922—S. Ganesan, Madras, India. Also pp. 938, 983, 987, 1118. It is important to get the clear ideas from the originator of this method. See also Chaps. XVII and XVI of Gandhi's —*Indian Home Rule*—S. Ganesan, Madras.

ing and changing. Disregard of one law for moral reasons does not destroy respect for all laws. Since non-violent resistance is a mode of ascertaining or testing the true consensus of public opinion, it is to be welcomed as an aid to stable government and a sensitive public conscience.¹

The point is so important that we feel obliged to refer to a brilliant exposition of it by H. J. Laski and to quote part of one especially pertinent paragraph, as follows :—²

“ The only ground for obedience to the state is where its purpose is morally superior to that of its opponents. The only ground upon which the citizen can give or be asked to give his support for the state is upon the conviction that what it is aiming at is, in each particular action, good. We should not support a given state because the ideal state is patterned upon Utopia. We should not even support a given state because its intentions are sincere. A catalogue of the actions of states undertaken from the highest possible motives could easily be made a list of errors now regarded as monstrous. No sincerity of purpose ever excludes the possibility of conduct for which no excuse can seriously be made. . . . The most passionate con-

1. See *The Ethics of Nullification* by R. C. Binckley—*The New Republic* for May 1, 1929, New York.

2. H. J. Laski—*The Dangers of Obedience*—*Harpers Magazine*, New York, for June, 1929.

viction of rightness is never a proof that we are not mistaken

.....“ The bad employer, the savage justice, the corrupt statesman, these exercise their authority only because they have not been challenged in the past. Let that challenge once be made forthrightly, and where one man has been bold, a thousand are prepared to follow him. And where a thousand are prepared to follow, those whose profession is the doing of wrong think twice before they act . . . The present conditions are not just merely because they are the present conditions ; they are just to the degree that justice is inherent in them.....”

Non-violent resistance tests the sincerity of the government and also that of the resisters. It is a method of search for social truth, and is strongly creative of the finest types of association and group life.

No just government need fear it. If met in the right way, it will help to conserve the best elements in every government. But it puts the moral profession of every government to an acid test, as to whether it really exists for the benefit of the governed.

Yet in rare cases non-violent resistance may be used as an instrument for sedition, just as newspapers, public speaking, military equipment or any of the

other means of ordinary political life may be so used. This was the case in Mr. Gandhi's Non-Co-operation Movement in 1922. Mr. Gandhi became convinced that British Government in India did much more harm than good, that it had violated its pledges countless times, and was beyond possibility of reform as an alien government there. He, therefore, made a determined effort to get rid of it by non-violent methods, and nearly succeeded. When arrested and tried, he pleaded guilty to the charge of sedition, and requested the court to give him a maximum sentence, as a part of the voluntary suffering which he believed to be an essential part of the persuasion and purification of non-violent resistance. As an indication of the plane upon which the whole struggle took place let me quote a few of the opening words from the decision of the District Judge, Mr. C. N. Broomsfield, I. C. S., who sentenced him :

“ Mr. Gandhi, you have made my task easy in one way by pleading guilty to the charge. Nevertheless, what remains, namely, the determination of a just sentence is perhaps as difficult a proposition as a judge in this country could have to face. The law is no respecter of persons. Nevertheless, it will be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever

tried or am likely to have to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that, in the eyes of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and a great leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of noble and of even saintly life. I have to deal with you in one character only. It is not my duty and I do not presume to judge or criticize you in any other character."

Surely, no *just* government should be afraid to meet the test of that sort of a struggle. And if that be sedition, it certainly is not hatred, nor anything that any man need be ashamed of.

If, as has been said, democracy is a form of moral and spiritual association, then creative non-violence is not a thing to be excluded from our group life, but welcomed as essential to it. It is the key to the problem of liberty in the modern state.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SPIRITUAL
IMPLICATIONS

THE very title of this chapter will repel such persons as have abjured religion. But let them not be too much upset by an adjective such as "spiritual," merely because it is not one of the words they like to use. There is no value in quarrelling about tags or names. If such people wish to include all intangible human forces under the subject of psychology, let them do so. Others prefer to classify and observe certain phenomena differently. Possibly both kinds of persons can find useful ideas in this chapter, despite differences as to terminology or interpretation.

It has been said that everyone sooner or later works out for himself a philosophy of life, a world-view, an attempt to state and explain life's meaning and purpose for him and his attitude toward

it. Non-violent resisters have their philosophies too. There are many varieties and sub-varieties—Buddhist, Jain, Hindu, Taoist, Christian—some religious, some purely philosophical, and some without any name.

As this is not a treatise on philosophy or religion, no inclusive statement of them can be attempted here, or even a full statement of any one. But the idea has so many philosophical and spiritual implications and connections that we cannot afford to disregard them entirely. It is linked with such matters as courage, death, suffering, self-sacrifice, anger, fear, love, hate, pity, duty, justice, responsibility, discipline, faith, time, eternity, creativeness—to name a few at random. All we will attempt is a statement of a few philosophical assumptions and a discussion of their relation to non-violent resistance.

In one sense, they are not a necessary set of assumptions for at least a partial understanding of non-violent resistance. Nevertheless, there are a number of situations which may arise in the practice of this programme which require an understanding of certain of these assumptions in order to know what is to be done or to soundly criticise a given action.

These assumptions and their applications are not the doctrines of any one school of philosophy or of any one religion. They are simply a sketch of one person's ideas. Others would have different ideas and put them together differently. These are offered merely as a sample, something for others to tear to pieces and refashion according to their own preferences.

Suppose we begin with the assumption that mind is primarily a sort of instrument by which man adapts himself to his environment in space and time, including other human beings and living creatures as part of the environment. It is a sort of space-time compass or tool.

Suppose we also assume that there is in the universe some principle or force called spirit, "beyond" or "above" the limits of space and time. Such an assumption is of course not provable by logic because logic is an affair of mind, and mind is limited to space and time. While mind can imagine systems or analogies beyond the proved facts as to space and time, as in hyper-dimensional geometries, the actual existence of forces or entities beyond space and time cannot be proven by logic. But it cannot be dis-

proven either. Hence we have a perfect right to make such an assumption.¹

Such a principle as spirit or God is very difficult to talk about because practically *all* our words in every language are full of spatial or temporal connotations. The very words "beyond" and "above," "inner," "immanence," and "transcendence" which are often used to try to describe spiritual verities are themselves spatial in meaning, and people have difficulty in conceiving of eternity except as an exceedingly long time.

Some who find difficulty in thinking in such terms may find a helpful analogy in hyper-dimensional geometry². Of course, strict scientists and mathematicians become scornful and resentful if any one attempts to use their beloved geometry as an analogy to aid in speculative thinking outside the realms of science and mathematics. But many scientific explanations are analogies, as for instance, Bohr's picture of the atom.

1. See J. W. N. Sullivan—*Aspects of Science*, Second Series—Collins, London, 1926; also his *Galileo, or the Future of Science*—Kegan Paul, London, and E. P. Dutton, New York, 1926.

2. Cf. *A New World*—A. T. Schofield, Allen & Unwin, London, 1920.

And if scientists would only read back in the history of science, they would find that many of the very words now used in science (such as law, order, rule, regular, arrange, progress, evolution, observe, etc.) were borrowed from mediaeval or ancient politics or religion.¹ Having borrowed so extensively from other fields in by-gone days, the scientists and mathematicians ought now to be willing to lend without heat.

Suppose we think of this spirit as the essence of life, and of human beings as space-time manifestations of this spirit. Spirit both transcends and is immanent in persons and in things of this world, just as the third dimension of a cube both transcends and cuts through and is within every part of each two-dimensional square which is a cross-section of the cube. If there is this spirit above, through and within each person and all mankind, it means that there is a spiritual unity to mankind. It unites them just as the hand unites the fingers, or the tree the branches, without destroying their individuality.² Birth is the temporal beginning of a certain manifestation

1. See Logan, Pearsall Smith—*The English Language*. Williams & Norgate, London, 1920.

2. Compare the biological unity of the human species.

of spirit in this world, death is its temporal ending. But the spirit is not begun or ended. It exists always, eternally. Space-time conditions are not unreal, they are simply incomplete, just as a square is incomplete in relation to the cube of which it is a cross-section.

Bertrand Russell contends against the immortality of the soul by saying that arguments in favor of it prove equally well that the soul would pervade all space.¹ Probably that statement is on the basis of the complete interchangeability of space and time co-ordinates, after Minkowski. But Indian philosophy accepts exactly that position—that the soul (*Atman*) does extend through all space, that it both transcends all things and is immanent in all things, as a fifth dimension would be, to use the mathematical analogy. Hence, to a Hindu, Russell's attempt at a crushing argument proves nothing whatsoever.

In the light of these concepts, affairs of the spirit, of eternity, would seem to be more important than those of this particular temporal life, although they include this temporal life as an essential part. To act on the basis of such con-

1. *What I Believe*—p. 18,—Kegan Paul, London ; E. P. Dutton, New York, 1925.

cepts, one must try to get a new sense of proportion. Those who read modern astronomy realize how tiny and microscopic a thing is man. They gain a very different sense of our importance in space and time, in the physical world. In the moral, philosophic and spiritual worlds, a similar correction of our sense of proportion is perhaps needed.

I do not talk much about religion here, for religion seems to me simply a mode or way of apprehending spiritual truths. Each nation and each age, and perhaps each person has a special religion, growing materially out of their peculiar character, history and environment. If God exists, He is infinite and eternal. There cannot be only one single road to an infinite being. There are an infinity of roads, of apprehensions, of religions, of philosophies.

Love is both a manifestation of the spirit in conduct and inner attitude and a means of understanding the spirit by conduct and inner attitude. Truth is an attribute of the spirit, and those who seek a further realization of spiritual life must strive for truth, whether they conceive of truth as relative or absolute. In such a view, courage would seem to be closely allied to love. It is a sort of reali-

zation, conscious or sub-conscious, of eternal life and higher spiritual existence. The courageous man risks his temporal life because other verities seem to him more important and profound. He identifies himself with these vaster and profounder ideals.

If we make some such assumptions as the foregoing, we may try to live in accordance with them even if we regard them only as assumptions, as fictions. Even though perhaps sceptically, we may live as if they were true and find out whether the results of so living are good or bad.¹

Again, if we make such assumptions as the foregoing, a number of philosophical, spiritual and moral problems involved in non-violent resistance are clarified.

For instance, we understand more readily why Gandhi has called non-violent resistance Satyagraha, which means literally "grasping or holding fast the truth." Things of the spirit are a deeper truth or reality than things of space and time. Violence is a spatio-temporal affair, for it proceeds on the assumption that death, time and separation are the greatest realities and forces. But mathe-

I. *The philosophy of 'As If'*—by H. Vaihinger—Harcourt Brace, New York; Kegan Paul, London.

maticians now know that the idea of distance (separation) is not a fundamental one. Non-violence goes on the assumption of the profound reality or truth of ideals, of the spirit, of the spiritual unity of mankind, of eternity and eternal life. The non-violent resister seeks for and clings to the greatest truth he can find. His methods of non-violence, he believes, are more in accordance with the eternal or spiritual.

It is interesting to find a modern Western psychologist, E. B. Holt, agreeing so closely with Gandhi, as in the following passage:—

"We have seen throughout that truth is the sole moral sanction, and that the discrimination of hitherto unrealized facts is the one way out of every moral dilemma. This is precisely to say that virtue is wisdom."¹

If the occurrences of life in this world are of significance only as material for spiritual experience, then death cannot be the tragedy and loss it is usually considered. It is not a thing to be feared. Even killing is not of fundamental importance, as Krishna tells Arjun in the *Bhagavad Gita*. The important thing is the effect of such an act upon the killer,

1. E. B. Holt—*The Freudian Wish*—Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1915, at p. 141.

upon the slain and upon others. If the aim of life is to attain what the Hindus call "self-realization," to realize God, to apprehend the spiritual unity of all the universe, then violent killing, by the fear it provokes, tends to be an obstacle to the person attacked, preventing him from feeling such a unity with his foe. And the anger of the attacker would also interfere with such realization by the attacker. This would help explain Christ's emphasis on the evil of anger and hatred and similar inner attitudes, for mere anger alone obstructs a realization of the spiritual unity of all creatures.

Force has its place in the world. Death is necessary to new life and creation, as the Hindu indicates by the attributes of Siva and Kali, and as Christ said in the verse, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit," and "He that loseth his life shall save it." But that is no reason why man should slay man.

Whitehead puts it thus :—¹

"The watchwords of the nineteenth century have been struggle for existence, competition, class warfare, commercial antagonism between

I. A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, Cambridge University Press, 1927, pp. 256, 257.

nations, military warfare. The struggle for existence has been construed into the gospel of hate. The full conclusion to be drawn from a philosophy of evolution is fortunately of a more balanced character. Successful organisms modify their environment. Those organisms are successful which modify their environments so as to assist each other. This law is exemplified in nature on a vast scale. . . . A forest is the triumph of the organization of mutually dependent species. . . . There is something in the ready use of force which defeats its own object. Its main defect is that it bars co-operation. Every organism requires an environment of friends, partly to shield it from violent changes, and partly to supply it with its wants. The Gospel of force is incompatible with a social life. By *force*, I mean *antagonism* in its most general sense."

Thus gentleness, *ahimsa* as the Hindus call it, is an important and necessary principle of social life. It is a means of expressing the spiritual unity of mankind and indeed of all life. And its psychological effect upon a person toward whom it is exhibited is to induce a corresponding kindness or perhaps love, a similar recognition of unity and kinship.

To love is to feel the unity of all life and things and the power of God, and to feel and realize it so strongly that all people near us, however vaguely, come to sense it too, and thereby come to have a stronger sense of unity and security. To

love is also to desire to create new life and more abundant life by the realization of this superabundant power and unity. To live as if we were eternal would be to live in love. Love gives fearlessness, openness, freedom and truth. It enables us to transcend time and space, as every mother knows; to realize our essential eternity and infinity.

In Peirce's *Chance, Love and Logic*¹ (p. 268), there is this fine passage:—

“ The love that God is, is not a love of which hatred is the contrary ; otherwise Satan would be a co-ordinate power ; but it is a love which embraces hatred as an imperfect stage of it, an Anterosyia, even needs hatred and hatefulness as its object. For self-love is no love, so if God's self is love, that which he loves must be defect of love ; just as a luminary can light up only that which otherwise would be dark. Henry James, the Swedenborgian says : ‘ It is no doubt very tolerable finite or creaturely love to love one's own in another, to love another for his conformity to one's self ; but nothing can be in more flagrant contrast with the creative love, all whose tenderness *ex vi termini* must be reserved only for what intrinsically is most bitterly hostile and negative to itself.’ ”

This serves to emphasize the creative aspect of love which was mentioned in

1. Harcourt Brace, New York ; Kegan Paul, London, 1923.

chapters III and IV. It is this creative element in true non-violent resistance which is so immensely important to the human race in all its affairs. It is this element, again, which makes the phrase, *non-violent resistance*, so inadequate to describe the action and attitude under discussion in this book. Gandhi's name for it, Soul-Force, is far more expressive and exact. It is something which does far more than merely remove anger and fear and violence. It is positively creative of finer individual character and a finer social order.

It seems probably that one reason why non-violent resistance has seemed weak to so many people is that most of its followers have failed to understand and apply fully and actively this creative factor in it. Thereby its creativeness lacked energy and failed to impress people with its true character. Also it seems probable to me that, psychologically, the creative energy of true soul-force or non-violent resistance is somehow connected with this realization of a unity after a preceding strong awareness of a diversity, which we consider at some length in this chapter. The creative effect of this process was carefully studied and strongly affirmed by the mathematicians, Gratry

and Boole.¹ They even used it as a definite psychological method to stimulate intellectual creation and imagination. C.F. Andrews suggests that the invigorating effect of a great realization of unity may account in part for the flaming energy of Islam.² It may also account in part for the energy of the French Revolution, whose watchwords were Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, and for the subsequent sweep of the political ideal of democracy. Doubtless, it accounts partly for the tremendous vigor of Communism in Russia.³

Because of this belief, I will deal at some length in this chapter with the unifying aspect of non-violent resistance in the hope that its creative power may thereby be more fully understood, tested and harnessed into action.

Creation requires energy. Hitherto in the history of mankind, anger and fear have been perhaps the chief means of stimulating physiological energy and

1. See M. E. Boole—*Boole's Psychology as a Factor in Education*—Benham & Co., Colchester, England; and *Ibid*—*The Mathematical Psychology of Gratry and Boole*—Swan Sonnenschein, London, 1897.

2. *The Body of Humanity*—Visva-Bharati Quarterly, April, 1925, Calcutta.

3. Arthur Moore—*Bolshevism from an Eastern Angle*—131, Atlantic Monthly, 690, May 192 .

action. Possibly the part that wrath and indignation play in the Muslim, Jewish, Zoroastrian and churchly-Christian religions has been an element in their dynamic. But anger and fear are fearfully wasteful modes of generating human energy and it is time to apply a little engineering to society and the individual by adopting this more efficient method of creating power—the realization of our common human unity in every situation.

It is as if there were in the depths of human nature and the human race a tremendous energy always seeking expression. Hitherto, much of it has found its outlet in explosions of anger, individual or communal. But wrath is an intoxicant, thrilling and often satisfying one for a time with the exhilaration of being a channel of great power, yet leaving a great depression and reaction afterward. But that energy can find better forms. The energy of unifying love does not proceed by ups and downs of action and reaction, but steadily increases and mounts up from strength to strength. Its resources are infinite. Non-violent resistance is the way by which we can implement this energy. It is like providing a steam engine or turbine by which the energy of steam can be put to productive

use instead of blowing up the boiler and smashing things.

(Love has tremendous creative energy and power. It has been said that every true virtue must be passionate, that is, must be brimming over with energy. The love in non-violent resistance has this positive, creative, exuberant passionate energy.) Energy, as William Blake said, is divine. It is our job to provide the instruments, methods and means whereby it may be harnessed to do the constructive creative task of building a nobler and more joyful world for mankind. It must pervade every detail and aspect of life.

This energetic element in love is realized more fully by examining love's opposite, fear. Fear is not merely a consciousness of probable separation and dread of loss by separation from something we desire or are attached to. Fear also implies a weakness or inability or fancied inability to maintain the security or attachment. In that respect it is like a lack of energy. Love is abundance of energy, fear is a relative lack or failure of energy.

To use the language and analogy of relativity, physics and hyper-dimensional geometry, we may think of energy as that

which causes events, which brings together or keeps together certain world lines, or which causes us to think of them or perceive them as being together. Love, operating in the higher, dimension, as it were, sees the connections between all things and events through that "higher" medium, and is thereby either content to maintain that kind of connection or security, or is actually able by its energy to create, that is to bring about, a drawing together of world lines in four-dimensional space-time. So love either dispenses with the need of space-time juxtaposition or actually brings it to pass.

Maintaining connection with this spiritual unity is the root of individual human life and group and national life.¹ Anger and hatred are so thoroughly divisive that they tend to cut off our awareness or realization of this unity. This is perhaps the explanation of the verse in the *Mahabarat*² which says, "He must not do any evil in return for an evil doer, but be always good and kind to him, for a wicked person willing to do any evil to anyone is killed by himself." That is,

1. Cf. T. Burrow—*The Social Basis of Consciousness*. Kegan Paul, London : Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927.

2. Vana 206, 42-43.

the wicked person by such actions kills himself by cutting himself off at the root. Of course, as the Indian scriptures have said, men may sometimes deny this unity and yet prosper in worldly affairs, gain what appears desirable, conquer enemies, but they *perish at the root*.

Many believe that we cannot love everybody, and that if we say that we love everybody we are deceiving ourselves. This may well be true if we cling to space-time conceptions and assumptions of the complete reality of diversities and separateness apparent to the senses and mind and feelings. But if we can think of and believe in a spiritual unity of mankind which transcends all space and time, then we can truly and sincerely love that essential aspect or part in everyone, however hampered and inadequate its expression may be. We could then overlook or brush aside as irrelevant the qualities which repel or annoy us, dirt, disease, ugliness, unpleasant temper, other faults, differences of ideals or purposes or apparent absence of them, lack of intelligence, differences of taste, nationality, race, history, etc., etc. We could then realize and love an inner something allied to that which is within ourselves.

Christ's commandment to love thy

neighbor as thyself is usually interpreted to mean *as much as thyself*. A more illuminating way to take it is "Love thy neighbor as if he were thyself." This brings out the fundamental unity between thyself and thy neighbor.

Again, we can find it easier to love others if we can only see that all men are trying to attain unity, power, security, peace, however mistaken their ways may be. For instance, the greedy man is really seeking security and unity, though on the wrong plane. The striver for material power is after a divine quality, though misapprehended by him. Even the cruel person is really looking for security and relief from fear, hate and revenge. All evils come from divisiveness, from a belief that the apparent separations of space-time are fundamental and wholly real. But behind all that illusion is the yearning and striving in every man to attain security, peace, power, plenty, unity, beauty, joy. As Socrates said, wisdom is virtue, ignorance makes sin. We easily forgive a person for their ill-temper, when we learn that at the time they were in pain, anxiety or ill-health. Perhaps we can learn to do the same for all sorts of faults and defects by realizing that both we and our neighbors and our enemies

and all mankind are in the disease of disunity and inner conflict growing out of our obsession with space-time divisions and pluralities.

Forgiveness is the result of a certain attitude or relationship—love. It can come only from love. So since God is in the other man as well as in ourselves (by our definition of spirit), we cannot get forgiveness from God (*i.e.*, unity with God) unless we first forgive men their trespasses against us. That is, we cannot love God within ourselves and ask love from God within ourselves unless we also have that same relationship with God outside ourselves, *i.e.*, in other men. We cannot both like and dislike God at the same time.

Forgiveness in reference to God's relation to man is an unfortunate term, because it is associated with ideas of judge and criminal, or of creditor and debtor. To me it would seem far better to translate or interpret that part of the Lord's prayer somewhat thus:—"Enable us to realize that we may feel our unity with Thee only to the extent that we express our unity with those from whom we have felt separated."

But does one dare to ask one who has lost everything that makes life worth

while to forgive those who robbed him ? There are millions who have lost wife or husband, father and mother, brothers and sisters, children, home, health, belongings, land, crops, money, prospects, social position, beauty, comfort, happiness, beliefs, trust, faith—all the value and joy of life—and have instead grinding poverty, sickness, squalor, misery, pain, anxiety, trouble, sorrow, ugliness. How can such people have any feelings toward the world but bitterness, cynicism, despair and hatred ?

I have seen such people rise from all their sickness, losses and wretchedness and create a new world for themselves. And that new world began by love and forgiveness. To create a new world on such slender beginnings requires tremendous creative power. Love is the only source of such power and energy. To suggest to them that they forgive is not an insult but a gift, if I may say so humbly. It is pointing to the road to power, plenty and joy.

Closely allied to love are sympathy, compassion and pity. In its true form, compassion for suffering is good because it helps both the sufferer and the compassionate one to realize the unity of mankind. It creates a sense of kinship.

But it is dangerous if it is allowed to become warped. Pity may easily become only a means of exercising a sense of superiority or of sympathetic anxiety or fear. Both of these feelings or sentiments are divisive in character and harmful to both parties in the situation. It is such distorted compassion or pity, I believe, that called forth Nietzsche's scorn and contempt.

To place too much stress on pity seems to me in effect to reproach the Creator for compelling us to dwell in this space-time continuum. It is a sort of kicking against the pricks and may lead to undervaluing the discipline and kind of growth which we get from living in this world. Pity and compassion, it seems to me, should not be too much a groaning with the pain of mankind and sympathetic sweating with their difficulties in such a way as to fill them with self-pity and keep them from realizing their higher nature or to emphasize to their minds the oppressiveness of space-time conditions. Pity and compassion should be a stimulus, not a soporific; an enlightenment and active help, not a comforting of their vanity or pride; an encouragement, not a dejected worry. Self-pity is of course a very debilitating

disease, whether it is indulged in by an individual or a class.

I do not advocate hard-heartedness, but instead a wide outlook, a sharing of a vision of eternity and hope, a realization of spiritual unity. The best help is to help others to help themselves, with their inner attitude as well as in exterior matters. Compassion calls for a recognition of the difficulties and hardships of living for every single creature. Though the difficulties are different in each case, none are without them, no matter how prosperous or care-free they may appear. We all have to meet suffering and we all need help in meeting it. Yet we must all try to meet it bravely and help others to meet it bravely. To avoid the slight fear—association and connotation of superiority, in our words ‘pity’ and ‘compassion,’ might not the Buddhist idea which we translate by those two words be better expressed by the words friendliness, gentleness and patience?

In contrast with the ideas of unity, eternity, infinity and transcendence of space-time which are associated with our ideas of spirit and God, are not all evils matters of separation, divisiveness, some sort of lack of unity or wholeness—and therefore matters of space and time? Even

socalled "spiritual" evils like pride, selfishness, hypocrisy, contempt are of this divisive nature. Consider whether all the following evils do not grow out of some essential separateness or division—sickness, pain, suffering, death, old age, fear, hunger, pride, contempt, anger, selfishness, hypocrisy, lying, stealing, murder, hatred, envy, jealousy, malice, threats, covetousness, sensuality, materialism, racial superiorities, social superiorities and snobbishness, lack of sympathy, cruelty, violence; irresponsibility, exploitation, spite, uncharitableness; grumbling.

If evil grows out of our obsession with the apparently complete and all-inclusive reality of space-time conditions, then love which transcends and rises above such conditions, is a true antithesis to evil. This is perhaps why it was said that "Love thinketh no evil" or "Taketh not account of evil." Love thinks that evils are of relatively small account because, although it considers the space-time continuum and its conditions and events as actualities, yet it considers them less real, less complete, less important, less significant by far than the eternal verities of the spirit.

The importance of constantly realiz-

ing this inner unity of all living creatures, especially mankind, is perhaps one reason for Christ's injunction to "judge not." Positive discrimination in order to select and use something wise and needed for our growth is a form of preference, and it need not dwell upon what is rejected. That is very different from the sort of judging which stresses the condemnatory part of the matter. Choice and selection and discrimination may be exercised without condemnation. What is poisonous or not useful to me may be useful to some other form of life or some other process of Nature. I may include them in a larger acceptance of God's universe even if I do not need them myself at this time. I can set them aside without disgust, fear or condemnation. God can accept and use all things, but I am more limited. I can accept certain things for my use and set aside and endure the remainder. That seems to be one important meaning in Christ's parable of the wheat and tares. Nowadays, tares might be found to make very good paper pulp, even though no good as food.

It is true that we cannot live without discriminating between good and evil. But in so doing it is better to use the

desire for good as our energizer, rather than our hatred of evil. It is more positive to put the emphasis on seeking good rather than on eschewing evil. Pay as little attention as possible to mistakes and evil and concentrate all our time and energy on the right, thus crowding the evil out with good. Unless the non-violent resister is constantly creating and constructing sound and fine conditions in his own camp, he can accomplish little with his resistance to evil elsewhere. His criticism, if he must use it, will have to be constructive, and as his greatest freedom is within himself, he can be most constructive at home. Therefore, his criticism should be of himself and his own side. It should be a process of what Gandhi calls purification. The term sounds strange in the West, but Gandhi is right.

The way to master your opponent is to outshine him, as Nietzsche said ; or to put it another way, the best method of controlling a situation is to have a superiority of power (organized energy) at one's disposal. That superiority of power is in the last analysis, personal. For example, really great financiers, statesmen and administrators excel chiefly in their ability to choose men and

to influence them to action. A great character is the result of much self-discipline and self-training and energy. Criticism, like charity, begins at home.

William Blake's belief in respect to judging men was interesting.

"He is insistent that neither sin nor righteousness should be imputed to personsbut to *states*. To change man it is therefore necessary to change *states*. It avails nothing to blame men for what they are or do; the only reasonable attitude to men whose characters and actions are the consequences of *states* is one of forgiveness. But while we forgive, it is our business to destroy the state in which human nature is perverted and to create the new state in which man will receive 'a new selfhood continually.'"¹

The *Bhagavad Gita* also enjoins us to refrain from condemnation.

Perhaps judging or discriminating in regard to conditions and principles is different from judging people. As regards people, "judge not that ye be not judged" may mean, do not separate yourself from others because if you do, they will separate themselves from you. Since we are all more or less blindly struggling toward unity and security, do not judge, because that tends to interfere with this process. If you are kind to-

1. R. Roberts, *The Ethics of William Blake*, 17 Hibbert Journal, 660.

ward other people, that tends to make them kind toward everyone; but if you are unkind toward them, then that tends to make them unkind toward every one.

The results of modern psycho-analysis are throwing interesting light on the injunction, "judge not, that ye be not judged." It appears that an expression of vigorous scorn, contempt or disgust toward another person means really that sometime in the past I had myself a failing similar to that toward which I now feel this repulsion, or even that in my secret heart or subconsciousness I now have a similar weakness. My strong feeling of repulsion is an inner attempt to separate myself from that quality, to keep myself from committing that person's mistake or fault. If I were not inwardly afraid of that failing, I would be quite serene, dispassionate and detached in my attitude.

If this be so, when we express a harsh adverse criticism of another, we have really criticized our inward selves. "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Or as Bernard Shaw has said, "All criticism is a form of autobiography." Under the circumstances, will it not be wise to both direct and confine our adverse personal criticism to ourselves? When express-

ed toward another it interferes with both his and my apprehension of the fundamental unity. I can be sure that I have enough faults to keep me exceedingly busy looking after my own improvement. I might possibly be able to help influence him by example, but exhortation is no good.

These considerations make one wonder whether the words, tone and manner of Christ's condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisees was correctly and fully reported. As they stand they seem consistent with his advice to rebuke an erring brother (Luke 17:3,4), and perhaps with his words about the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12: 31, 32); but they are much more severe than his advice as to how to treat an offending brother (Matt. 18: 15-17). They are perhaps not inconsistent with his injunction to forgive seventy times seven. Yet even a bitter necessary truth can be kindly stated, and the subsequent passage about the hen gathering her chickens under her wing suggests that perhaps the actual manner in which the criticism was spoken by Christ may not have been fully rendered by the recorders.¹ This may also

1. Cf. B. H. Streeter—*The Four Gospels*, Macmillan, 1924, p. 253; *ibid*—*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Oxford University Press, London, 1911.

apply to his manner when he called Peter 'Satan.'

Marston shows quite clearly¹ that in anger (indignation) there is always a certain element of being thwarted or baffled by an obstacle. But it seems to me that Christ's insight and wisdom in all the other situations of his life were so profound, as to raise doubt whether he could be angered even by the Pharisees.

Acts, institutions, conditions and systems which are mistaken, harmful or wrong must be described accurately and truly; and some nouns and adjectives are not pleasant. To say such things may be difficult, but the manner of doing it need bear no personal ill-will whatsoever. To say harsh things of persons as persons is very rarely a useful or effective thing to do.

Of course, sometimes it seems necessary to place a clear, powerful picture or statement of reality and the future directly in front of very stubborn, proud or hypocritical minds, in order to arouse them to the importance of a change and the full meaning of their mistake. But query whether that should be done so as

1. W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*,—Harcourt, Brace, New York, and Kegan Paul, London 1928, pp. 364-5.

to arouse fear or anger. Those are divisive emotions, and can divisive means ever lead to unity? Perhaps certain minds can win through to a vision of unity only by the method of trial and error, after having exhausted every other possible method. We can think of Christ suffering such a state of affairs; but to me, the idea of his angering the Pharisees by condemning them personally very harshly, and himself being angry with them, seems inconsistent with his depth of insight. He said that there is joy in heaven over one sinner who repents; but need we imply further that there is anger or indignation in heaven over a sinner who for any reason fails to repent?

A Hindu, believing in rebirth, would feel that there is no necessity for getting so indignant over any sin or sinner. The sinner will have a chance to learn better in some subsequent birth. Each soul advances as fast as it is capable. And since the Christians profess also to believe in eternal life, why need they get so hot toward people who are unjust, cruel or hypocritical?

This does not mean that we should be indolent about such matters. Be as swift and energetic as possible to create and build up right conditions, but why be

so inefficient with time and energy by calling anyone harsh names in a harsh way? Isn't that the meaning of the parable of the wheat and tares? Don't spend time trying to uproot evil. Rather concentrate all energy on helping the good forces to become so strong as to crowd out evil. It is true that destruction must often precede construction, but perhaps we are merely confusing our time-scales when we think that destruction must be sudden, catastrophic and violent, and that construction must always be slow. In a great assemblage of life such as a forest, the natural destruction of decay is no less effective for being slow. It is a replacement of one kind of life by another.

In view of these considerations, we will be wise to acquire a large enough view of life to make it possible to do without irritation, impatience, indignation, disgust, disdain, scorn, contempt, aversion, repugnance, reproaches, long enduring regrets or shames. They are all akin to anger or fear. Love of good and beauty is strong and positive, but hatred of wrong is negative and weaker. We must steadily face and move toward the future and the better. There are always fresh and interesting opportunities

and possibilities up to the last moment here on earth, if we will only open our minds and eyes to them.

I do not mean that it would be wise to suppress these divisive emotions, if in fact they exist within us. That would be a form of psychological violence. I mean that one should try to acquire such a vision of or attitude toward oneself and other people and the meaning of life and its situations as to canalize all our energy into creating positive good and to have that energy so great as to disregard the evils and obstacles, just as our eager enthusiasm to reach the top of a mountain and see the glorious view makes us largely disregard the toil and heat and obstacles of the climb. Such a widely integrated attitude will lift the conflict to a higher level where a more inclusive synthesis can be made. This synthesis will use the energy of all elements in the conflict, and hence not result in any repression.¹ Then the divisive emotions will not arise at all, or if they do arise their energy will promptly be sublimed and led off into creative channels. Such an accomplish-

1. See W. A. White—*Mechanisms of Character Foundation*, Chaps. IV, V, XII, Macmillan, New York, 1920; E. B. Holt—*The Freudian Wish*—H. Holt, New York, 1929.

ment is not simple or easy, but neither is any other worth while ideal easy.

Many kindly people reserve a place for righteous indignation in their scheme of ethics. They consider it a sign of strength. But the mere fact that we have all felt it does not make it desirable or wise, any more than a stomach-ache is good for the same reason. It is a form of anger even though it is usually felt on behalf of other people weaker than ourselves, or because of some injustice, cruelty, or meanness. One cannot deny its ability to arouse and direct energy, but the same is true also of all forms of anger.

We will see in the next chapter that an end, which in the beginning of our course seems good, does not justify us in using a bad means to reach it. If then we are agreed that anger is a harmful emotion, we should not try to justify its use by pointing to the good end of the removal of injustice or brutality or meanness toward other weak people. Is that not really what people are doing when they seek to justify their anger by calling it 'righteous indignation?' Is it not rather an inefficiency, a confusion of not seeing how, for the moment, to overcome the evil, and resorting to the energy of violence instead of the energy of creative-

ness?¹ It is a sign not of strength but of weakness.

Again, may not one reason for the kind man's 'righteous indignation' be the fact that often he has no available instrument or method of changing the mind and heart of the wrong-doer? If he really were skilled in and accustomed to an effective 'manipulative activity,'² such as non-violent resistance, would he not be more apt to utilize it instantly without wasting any time or energy over the person who is making the mistake? That is what we do in all the other difficult situations in life for which efficient tools have been invented. It seems probable that the acceptance of a clear cut plan of action such as non-violent resistance would give distinct physiological relief. Incidentally, since Christ was so well aware of this instrument and used it so effectively on numerous occasions even against the Pharisees, is that not another reason for doubting the accuracy of the report of the manner of his condemnation of them?

Webster's Dictionary defines indignation as "A treating with indignity or

1. See W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People* pp. 364-366, previously cited.

2. Of citation from Rivers in Chap. III.

regarding as not worth notice ; anger mingled with contempt, disgust or abhorrence ; righteous anger." The Murray (Oxford) Dictionary defines it as "The action of counting or treating (a person or thing) as unworthy of regard or notice; disdain, contempt ; anger at what is regarded as unworthy or wrongful; wrath excited by a sense of wrong to oneself or, especially, to others, or by meanness, injustice, wickedness, or misconduct ; righteous or dignified anger ; the wrath of a superior." This would suggest that indignation often tends to be associated with an assumption of moral superiority on the part of the indignant person. Thus the righteousness of such anger would seem to be somewhat self-righteous and puritanical. It is interesting to note in this connection that truly humble people seldom show indignation. This squares with much of the teaching of the *Bhagavad Gita* and of Lao Tsu. This is all a point to ponder over, especially by those who desire to be non-violent resisters. Our increase of psychological knowledge and human experience has probably lessened the value of righteous indignation in modern society. I am inclined to believe that it is time for us to try to work away from it to more effective means of stimulus and guidance.

There are many aids to gaining a strong sense of spiritual unity. Among them are love, compassion, humility, faith, courage, hope, humor, art and prayer. These things must be practised and exercised in order to yield the result desired. To practise them requires translating them into action and attitude every day and hour. Intellectual and emotional understanding of such unity are not enough. Really profound understanding and conviction come only out of exercise, practice, action and experience.

XIII

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SPIRITUAL IMPLICATIONS

(Continued)

LET us now consider some other factors.

Humility is a quality which, in the West at least, is usually misunderstood, despised and derided. It is confused with weakness, cowardice and lack of self-respect. It is considered a servile soporific, a preventer of progress, a dull and torpid resignation to things as they are. Its association with non-violent resistance has helped to bring the latter into disfavor.

But, as we have tried to indicate, humility is really a true sense of spiritual values and proportion. For this reason it is a very important factor in the equipment of a non-violent resister. Such a person is trying to change age-old habits

of mind, emotion and conduct, and he must have a very clear vision of relative values and ultimate verities. Because of the importance of this quality of humility, it will be wise to explain it somewhat fully.

Humility is not mere lowliness, but a consciousness that distinctions of size, rank and other temporal and spatial qualities are relatively unimportant, irrelevant and often misleading, because of their transcendence by things of the spirit. Humility is a sort of spiritual equalitarianism. It is a pre-requisite to an understanding of things of the spirit, as a sense of spatial proportion is necessary for an understanding of architecture. Humility involves non-assertion, but physical violence and anger involve aggression and assertion. Therefore non-violent resistance requires humility.

The words, "obscure," "lowly," "humble" and "meek" are usually spoken in a derogatory or patronising sense. But they should not be, for when we reflect we realize that the most wonderful of God's own ways are obscure, hidden, secret, unnoticed, quiet, unseen. To be obscure does not necessarily result in being Godlike, but it is at least a surer beginning than to be noisy or notorious.

To be famous is to be in a very dangerous position.

In the realm of the spirit, magnitude, quantity, size, rank and degree are less important than quality. Small acts of the right quality are as important as big ones. Humble, obscure lives lived rightly are as important to God, it would seem, as the great and famous ones.

Humility is a truly scientific spirit, willing to sit down before any fact, however small, and learn from it. "It implies a constant sense of the possible reversal of all human judgment." It gauges its values not by reference to other men, but by reference to God. By reference to God its abnegation and depreciation is seen to be only a true sense of relative values. It is not an inferiority complex in relation to other men. Rather it inclines toward equalitarianism in relation to man. Humility is a sort of caution to protect us against errors and divisions arising out of our obsession with space and time. It is an awareness of our difficulties and our liability to false reasoning or false assumptions or lack of knowledge and insight. It is a wise discipline.

Yet humility should perhaps not be too closely associated (negatively) with

ideas of size and rank. At the beginning it must be so, but the final truth of it seems to be more than that. Usually we speak of a great man "rising above" all distinctions of rank or caste, whereas, the very humble man might be said to "go so low" as to escape or get outside of all ideas of rank and dimension in a different direction. It is a mode of escaping from concepts of separateness involved in pride, a method of reaching unity, of seeking God. It is a kind of spiritual receptiveness. Humility and faith together make a man live experimentally. If a given experiment turns out to be a mistake, non-violence makes each man pay for his own mistakes, and relieves all others of the burden, so far as possible.

An illustration of the real positiveness involved in an apparently humble action is given in the saying of a mediaeval Indian saint, Nanak, to a disciple. He said, "Farid, if a man insult thee, stoop and touch his feet. Thus enterest thou the temple of the Lord." Touching the feet is an Indian form of salutation to a revered person. An insult would be an attempted violation or rupture of the spiritual unity between men. If the insulted person immediately were to

answer with a reverent salute he would be asserting strongly his belief in the continued existence of that spiritual unity. His act would be a symbol of his intention to deny or close up the separation attempted by the insulter. It would be an assertion of unity in the face of difficulty. It would thereby be a returning of good for evil.¹ It is a more creative manner of expressing the truth contained in Marshall Foch's saying that "a battle won is a battle in which one will not confess oneself beaten." Indeed, Nanak's gesture goes further. It recognizes and asserts the existence of the spirit of God in every man, even in a hostile person, and makes obeisance to that spirit and to the man as its dwelling place or temple.

But if this sort of action is desirable, is it not equivalent to letting any and every insolent ruffian walk right over you? Where is the resistance in such an act? Is it not inconsistent even with non-violent resistance? No. It is not mere acceptance, merely lying down. It is resistance, a contradiction, to the attempt of the insulter to create a breach. Non-violent resistance on every

1, Cf. the similar action of Father Zossima in Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*.

occasion proceeds upon the basis that spirit—God, if you will—dwells within every man, that every person is a child of God. It is an attempt to appeal to that spirit, that better nature, no matter how crusted over with mistaken ideas and habits. It assumes a sort of spiritual democracy of mankind. It will not permit that spiritual bond of unity to be denied or set aside, or broken.

The non-violent resister returns evil for good, not because he is a namby-pamby, but because he believes that the spiritual unity of mankind is the most important thing in the world and that such an action is the most efficient means of maintaining what he believes in. His humility is important as a means of apprehending spiritual truths, but he will not allow it to be used as an excuse for trampling on him or on defenseless people, for such trampling or exploitation would be an attempted denial of the underlying spiritual equality and unity of mankind, a denial that all men have the dignity of sons of God.

When I say spiritual equality, I do not mean that all men are equal in body, mind, ability and estate or necessarily ever can be. But bodies, mental, aesthetic and other skills and abilities are only

instruments or tools with which we work in this space-time world. The mere fact that one carpenter has a fine set of tools while another has a poor set of tools does not prove that the first is a better carpenter or a better man. Indeed he may be worse in both respects, or equal to the other. So the inner spiritual value of a person cannot be proved or estimated by any of our tests for quality of mind or ability. We must respect the true inner worth of each person and treat them all equally or somehow symbolize toward them our recognition that they are children of God.

This belief of the non-violent resister that every man, no matter how low, poor, mean and unpromising he is, because of that divine essence, is capable of marvellous growth and improvement, is probably one reason why all groups which have practised it for any considerable period have become so awakened, so greatly strengthened, full of hope, moral drive, splendid community spirit, capable of superb generousities and gallant kindness, so industrious, steady and fine.

The non-violent resister tries to act as if there were spiritual kinship or unity between himself and his opponent and everyone. Action upon that basis seems

to enable him not only to discover various previously unrealized unities and possibilities of joint action, but even to create them.

Forgiveness of injury, then, is a *giving* of good in return *for* harm. It is a creative action and attitude. It is a positive assertion of spiritual unity.

We can see now why the men of Dante's time considered pride as so deadly a sin (mistake). Pride emphasizes and exalts division, rank and separateness, and attempts to end the unity of men and of the world. All sins (mistakes) are mistakes of imputing a separation or loss where in truth there is none of importance. But pride not only creates a division but exults and glories in it, makes an evil doubly so. Pride about one's spiritual realizations is a denial of the spirit, the unity itself. Especially dangerous is pride because of being humble, and pride because one is a sufferer.

Pride leads to fear, because it overvalues something, and divides and emphasizes *I* and *mine* apart from *you* and *yours*. Then out of this separateness comes the possibility of loss. But spiritually the pride has already separated that thing (lost it) from the great underlying unity,

from the proud person's real ultimate Self. So pride is a great deception caused by over-emphasizing the data of space and time. For pride to fear loss is a sort of joke—a locking the stable door after the horse is stolen. So also with most forms of respectability. They are a form of pride, a cage.¹ All ideas of rank and separateness are pathetic spiritual jokes, as it were. Whatever we try to separate from unity, to take away from God, to appropriate to our separate self (including the soul itself) we *lose*, because each of us is in reality and essence a manifestation of the all-inclusive Self, a son of God. And as Hocking says, “selfishness predisposes to fear.”²

Inasmuch as pride is perhaps the greatest mistake of the white race, the humility of the yellow, brown and black races will be a tremendous assistance to them if and as soon as they enter upon a large movement of non-violent resistance against white aggression. The pride of the whites is a terrible load and cause of stumbling to themselves.

Since so much fear and anger come out of our beliefs and customs as to pro-

1. Cf. *Nietzsche and the Aristocratic Ideal* by A. K. Rogers, 30 *Int. J. of Ethics* 450, Oct. 1919.

2. *Morale and 'its' Enemies* p 161.

perty, it will perhaps be wise to examine some of those beliefs.

Actual materials are our means of physical living and security. In the chapter on economics we have seen that there is ample solar power to provide adequate food, clothing and housing for every member of the human race, if we will only organize ourselves to get it. The actual forms of organization so far in history have been many, and most of them have been built upon wrong assumptions as to the possible amount of food and other means of existence. A part of this organization is our system of legal property. There have been many such systems in different ages and lands. But they are all symbols of security.

Since all ultimate matters are spiritual, ultimate security must be spiritual. Security would then seem to be a sort of realization of unity with God. If this be true, property would seem to be a false symbol, for property, as the West knows it, is essentially a legal right to exclude other persons from the use or control of the thing which we legally own. Thus property rights are exclusive and divisive, whereas true security would have to be inclusive and unifying. In this world of space and time certain sorts of

property rights in certain sorts of things may be very useful, but they probably ought to be limited. Or to put it another way, our present difficulties in operating and living under existing property systems are great enough to raise strong doubt as to whether they are as perfect as we can attain, that is to say, whether they ought not to be improved.

In order truly to possess anything we must become one with it. This can be done completely only in the realm of the spirit, though partly by mind. But it cannot be truly done at all by law or violence, for both these imply dualism and divisiveness. Learning how to possess truly—in spirit—should be a joy. It is a sort of sublimation of the old acquisitive instinct and should derive much energy and persistence from that.

In this connection compare the following passage from Havelock Ellis' *The Dance of Life* (p. 307)

"Two men desire to possess a woman, and one seizes her, the other writes a '*Vita Nuova*' about her; they have both gratified the instinct of possession, and the second, it may be, most satisfyingly and lastingly. So that—apart from the impossibility and even the undesirability of dispensing with the possessive instinct—it may be well to recognize that the real question is one of values in possession. We

must needs lay up treasure ; but the fine artist in living, so far as may be, lays up his treasure in Heaven."

Later in that book (p. 323) Ellis speaks of art as "enabling us to penetrate into life." This indicates the function of art in helping us to achieve spiritual unity and understanding. In this connection we remember Blake's conception of Christ as a supreme artist. Tagore and Kabir are important in this aspect.

The ordinary operations of the instinct for possession would thus seem to be a dim groping attempt or symbol for unifying oneself with all. Surely we can make our attempt more expressive of the reality.

Giving and receiving, sharing of food, goods and money, are space-time symbols of or attempts to express the spiritual unity beyond and above space-time. Perhaps this explains the verse in I Corinthians 13, "And if I give all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing." That is, the giving is only a *symbol* of unity, of love, and the symbol is no good without the reality behind it. The spirit behind the giving is more important than any exact mathematical distribution, though that too may be

important as a symbol of an inner attitude. For these reasons Christ was right in laying the chief emphasis on love rather than on justice. This also explains the emphasis placed upon alms, charitable giving and sharing in Islam, Judaism, Hinduism and Buddhism. Giving, by reason of its more positive nature in action, is more apt than mere receiving to remind us of the underlying unity. Hence the saying, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

In one sense it may be said that it is not so important for the well-off to give to the poor merely because of their poverty, but because between the poor and the well-to-do there is one of largest gulfs for people of ordinary comprehension. Therefore to bridge that division is strongly conducive to a realization of the fundamental unity between the two. And if the gift is made in a manner and spirit in accordance with that deeper purpose, it will help both giver and receiver to that realization of unity and thus to happiness. But if the gift is made rudely, brusquely, grudgingly, or with secret wish to acquire public favor to flatter one's self-esteem, then the unification cannot be realized and the reaction leaves the situation worse than before.

Even the motive of improving the condition of the poor, without love or the desire for spiritual unity, is of little or no use. Here is where so much Western organized charity fails.

Often we are ready to give or share something with other people, and yet become much annoyed if it is stolen from us or taken or borrowed without asking permission. Such a state of affairs naturally raises the query whether the giving may not be an indulgence of one's pride or sense of virtue and superiority, rather than really being a spontaneous expression of love or a feeling of unity with others. It is not the exterior act that counts, but the spirit with which it is done. This attitude of realizing the inner unity helps explain Christ's injunction, "Give to him that asketh." Would it not perhaps be better to treat a theft of goods as if it were a retro-active opportunity to give, and therefore as a symbol of sharing? Being cheated by a weak and poor person thus becomes a sort of involuntary sharing.

To say this is not to condone stealing. Stealing is a mistake, but its error perhaps does not lie in the thief's failure to distinguish between mine and his, or even in his mistakenly assuming that in the

everyday space-time world there is the same apparent complete unity of things that exists in the spiritual realm. Rather his mistake lies in his failure to perceive the necessity for complete experience and realization of the truth by each individual, that is to say, the necessity for self-reliance and self-dependence in order to get the full value of experience of life. He should not allow himself to become a parasite.

This view is, of course, not the whole of the matter, but it perhaps has some validity. It may be corrected by the realization that most stealing is, at bottom, not the fault of the thief, but is an almost inevitable result of the pressure on certain unfortunate people of our exceedingly faulty social and property system and our court methods. Indeed, often certain classes of society to which the thief does not belong are largely parasitic upon his class.

The thief would argue that it was only a case of tit for tat; that he was only taking away by violence something which the alleged owner had acquired and kept only by the violence of the State. It would not always be easy to prove that the thief's observation and course of thought were wholly mistaken.

The property concept is an essential part of capitalism and our attitude toward it. The energy of capitalism is good; its greed and the results thereof are bad. Although we readily grant that much of the "high standard of living" in which the West has so much faith is really a high standard of wasting, must we, in our effort to escape the evils of capitalism, go the whole distance and accept the idea of certain Eastern philosophers that desire is the root of all suffering and evil and thus try to eliminate desire?

Socialism does not seem to me to reach the heart of the problem. Though I may be mistaken, its chief result seems to enlarge the size of the competing unit from the individual to the State. A mere change of scale and external organization will not essentially alter the problem. Somehow the motives and values of men must be qualitatively changed.

Desire comes because of our prepossession or obsession with concepts of time and space. Desire is present and grows because we believe that our separation in time or space from things, people, power, satisfactions of senses or of faculties is a complete reality. But if we were strongly and continually filled with a vivid sense of our spiritual unity

with all things and people, of our eternity, of our infinity, of our soul's transcendence of time and space, then many desires would fade away and others would be no stronger than the rest of our necessary and normal consciousness of worldly life and the necessary limitations of time and space. Thereby, desires would assume reasonable and easily manageable proportions.

Thus desires are symptoms or results, not original entities. Hence, we cannot successfully avoid whatever evil results they may have, by direct attack upon desire or by trying to suppress or eliminate it. That is the error of a certain school of asceticism.

The way to conquer whatever evils desire may produce is to learn to get a larger view, to transcend time and space, to get a strong sense of the spiritual unity of all life and all the manifestations of God, to realize the eternity and infinity of our souls, to realize that although conditions of space and time are actual and real, yet they are only a lesser reality, a partial truth. Such a process is not negative, but positive. Such realization can best come through love, compassion, faith, hope, courage, humility, art, humor.

Again, desire is a part or mode of the

universal energy, a part of all life. Since we are dwellers in the space-time continuum we must accept its conditions, one of which is a sense of separateness and hence of desire, lack and need. Yet if we will acquire and maintain the right sense of proportion on our space-time conditions, we will find the ordinary sense of separateness less insistent. We will find that we can get behind our desires and control them and keep serene even when they are thwarted. Yet by recognizing these desires as an expression of energy and to that extent valid, we need not become lazy or apathetic. Thus we can lightly control the steeds of our desire and also make them do useful work. The principle of spiritual unity and supply assures us that even though a particular desire fails of satisfaction, the loss is compensated by a gain to life in some other centre. Solar energy will provide our material needs.

If we firmly believed in the spiritual unity of mankind, every man would become a brother, and men of power would no longer try to use other men as mere tools or means to selfish ends. That would result in economic justice. That would provide both the motive and standard for a sound limitation of desire. The

needed restraint would come by positive love instead of by negative denial. It would be a transfer or redirection of energy rather than a suppression.

Perhaps some of the harsh restrictiveness of certain kinds of asceticism up till now has been due to the fact of there being only a limited fund of material goods to be shared in this world. But modern science makes the possibility of material wealth and food practically limitless, and its distribution easy. Any shortages now are due only to the stupidity and selfishness of men, their insistence on always making a money profit.

But the expansion of the possible supply of food, clothing and other goods does not do away with the necessity for individual, group and national restraint. It merely changes its purpose. Up till now restraint was desirable in order to share the limited fund of goods with as many people as possible. Presently restraint will be needed as a sort of engineering measure of efficiency, a sort of neatness and avoidance of clutter, a refusal to eat too much in order to preserve maximum health. The spiritually minded person thus confines his worldly impedimenta to a minimum so as to be

able to devote more time and energy to the part of life which he considers most important. Asceticism thus resumes its original Greek meaning of the limitations undergone by an athlete in order to win a contest.

It seems to me that the widespread adoption and use of non-violent resistance would be the most effective of all practical measures toward this desired realization of human unity. It would directly resist and curb the evils of capitalism and at the same time be building the essential psychological and spiritual foundations for some better order of society which is as yet unborn and therefore has no name.

The Western mind repudiates the Eastern conception of there being a value in suffering. To the extent that the Western attitude has driven men to seek knowledge of how to prevent suffering of various sorts, it is excellent. But that it is not sufficient seems to be indicated by the fact that the West has not yet banished suffering, even in physiological matters, to say nothing of economic, social and moral realms. Probably then, Eastern thought is not altogether astray.

If we grant the greater importance of spiritual perspective over that of mere

space and time, it would seem that perhaps, in the cases where it is taken in the right way, suffering may have value in so far as it drives men to seek life and strength from God within themselves rather than from external things. I do not mean by this for one moment to lessen our efforts to attain for everyone economic justice and comfort, fullest possible education, and all the other good exterior things of this life. Nevertheless, I know that our physical energy comes from within, an inner synthesis of right food, good digestion, good air and a well-directed mind; that creative acts come from further within—the mind and will and heart; that sound ultimate guidance and right attitude comes from still further within—the spirit.

Death, sorrow and some sort of suffering are experienced by all mankind, rich and poor, wise and simple, great and lowly, regardless of all the achievements of science or philosophy. Is it a mistake then to try to wring some good or value out of this common experience? In so far as the suffering is voluntarily undergone, as in non-violent resistance, it would seem capable of being still more useful to the sufferer, in the direction already indicated, as well as in ways explained in pre-

vious chapters. Because suffering is a common element in all human life, the meeting and enduring of suffering, after the first shock, gives the sufferer an awareness of his or her unity with all humanity. That is probably the reason why the poor, who suffer most, have, on the whole, a clearer sense of our common humanity than do the comfortable and wealthy.

There are some lines by William Blake which help illuminate our subject, as commented upon by Mr. Richard Roberts:—

“He who would do good to another must do it
in Minute Particulars.

General Good is the plea of the scoundrel,
hypocrite, and flatterer;

For Art and Science cannot exist but in
minutely organized Particulars,

And not in generalizing Demonstrations of the
Rational Power.”¹

.....“Abstract moral ideas are mere creatures of the mind, and possess no concrete existence save as actual relations between persons. It is easy to utter large sounding generalities about justice and liberty and to think and speak of them as objective realities in themselves, whereas they do not have any actual substance apart from persons. That is

1. William Blake—*Jerusalem*, f. 55, Ll. 60-66.

why so many crimes have been committed in the name of justice and of liberty. It is possible to deny them to men in the very act of defending them. We may belie our ideals by the very means we use to reach them. The one sovereign sanctity is personality ; the sacredness of justice and liberty is a derivative from this. They are holy because they are the only conditions under which personality can rise to its full stature ; and they are not to be fought for by any method which dishonours personality. That were to subordinate the greater to the less, to undermine and destroy the foundations on which one professes to be building. It is personality—at once a Minute Particular and the one real Universal—that supremely matters..... True reverence for and a right relation to personality—this is the law and the prophets... Selfishness, whether of the individual or of the group, is the abiding curse."¹

The non-violent resister believes that the principle of goodwill cannot be established among men by methods which are in themselves the opposite of goodwill. He claims that the agent sinks or rises inevitably to the level of the methods which he employs. Therefore, he cannot use or support violence.

But many idealistic militarists reply that it is possible to handle pitch without

1. Richard Roberts—*Ethics of William Blake*—17 Hibbert Journal, 660 (1918).

being defiled. Their position was well stated by Mr. Charles E. Park.¹

"I claim the right to draw a sharp line between the quality of my outward actions and the quality of my inner frame of mind, my mood, my motive. Physical violence does not inevitably connote spiritual violence. Stern, repressive, coercive measures of the hands may spring from inner fountains of unalloyed goodwill Goodwill has its seat primarily in the heart ; and . . . so long as it is enthroned securely in the heart, it is possible and safe, and sometimes practically necessary, to protect it as a principle by means of outward coercion."

Mr. Park may be right in regard to certain limited kinds of action as, for instance, controlling a dangerous lunatic, under limited circumstances. But his statement would not justify any one in going to war, because in war the exigencies of actual combat inevitably produce anger, hatred and fear. As soon as Mr. Park's ideal soldier felt angry or hating, he would have to resign (i.e., desert) and take the consequences, if he is to restore or maintain the integrity of his inner feeling. Armies could hardly be maintained on that basis. William James somewhere describes the debilitating effect of failing to express emotion by

1. *Why are You not a Pacifist?*—119 Atlantic Monthly 745, June 1917, Boston, U.S.A.

some sort of appropriate action. Somehow the emotion of love or goodwill will die if the subsequent action is not loving. Killing a healthy man in war and thereby causing sorrow to his dear ones, an economic loss all around, and frequently an uneasy feeling within one's self somehow does not seem very loving. If you have to love general principles or a particular nation so much as to hate and kill people in order to maintain the object of your love, much doubt arises.

That brings us to the important question of the correct relation between thought and conduct, inner attitude and outer action.

As non-violent resistance is primarily a spiritual attitude, we cannot lay down any but provisional rules of external conduct. But such rules will hold for the most part.

Acts, if of a certain kind and done with the right desire, spirit and method, do tend to strengthen corresponding qualities, or attitudes of heart or spiritual relationships, already existing at least in germinal conditions within, or to stimulate latent faculties. This is one reason for certain general rules of conduct or for religious ceremonial. But conduct is also

an expression or indication of certain inner states. Presumably this is the meaning of "by their fruits ye shall know them." Action is one test of inner quality.

Action is a completion of thought and will, and unless the action is carried out, the idea and purpose are never fully understood by the outsiders or even by the thinker. Thought is the preliminary muscle-setting or minute play of tentative muscle-settings and nervous coordinations preparatory to action. The action clarifies and strengthens and defines the thought. Action is necessary for wholeness of character. Action is the ripening of thought. We think with our bodies as well as with our minds. Conduct and thought and feeling cannot be sharply distinguished in life without harm befalling. Does this not perhaps invalidate Mr. Park's contention?

Thus, it is probably only as conduct is thoughtfully guided or initiated, can it be an aid to spiritual self-realization. If an action is blindly done, "the flesh profiteth nothing."

The value of moral conduct is not in itself, but because and in so far as it helps us and others to realize and understand spiritual laws better.

All this perhaps helps to explain why a supposedly good end does not justify a bad means. In human affairs an end organically grows out of the series of acts which are regarded as means towards it. Thus the end as actually achieved always partakes of the nature of the means employed. Many entered upon the Great War, thinking that the end was to be justice and liberty. But the means employed changed all that and resulted in the treaty of Versailles and a million evils. Therefore, we must be very careful to employ only good means, no matter how noble and beautiful our initial picture of our ultimate aim may be.

E. B. Holt explains this point as follows:—¹

“.....And these *all* hinge on the fallacy of ends: for a certain ‘desireable end, a man will do this ‘in itself objectionable’ deed. But then when the end is obtained he is grieved to discover that it turns out to be undesirable, and he finds that it is rendered undesirable because of the very deed by which he attained it. This has been through all the ages the dying plaint of unprincipled and ‘successful’ men. It is only a question, once more, of being wise and observant enough to foresee that the taint attaching to the means is going to linger on and infect the end. The doctrine of the wish

1. *The Freudian Wish*, above cited.

shows us that life is not lived for ends. Life is a process ; it is a game to be played on the checker-board of facts. Its motion is forward ; yet its motive power comes not from front (from 'ends') but from behind, from the wishes which are in ourselves. We shall play the game rightly if, instead of so painfully scrutinizing and trying to suppress our wishes, we turn about and lucidly discriminate the facts."

This agrees with what we said above about desire. Also it lends modern explanation and emphasis to the old injunction. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life."

In view of all these considerations, especially the necessity for truth and consistency between the inner attitude and outer conduct, we may say not that non-violent resistance is always the right conduct but that it is always the possible and right conduct provided that the requisite courage, love, understanding or faith are present. If there is not enough of any of these qualities to enable one to use non-violent resistance (soul-force), then use whatever weapons one does have faith in. Be sincere and true to yourself in any event, even though the action seems regrettable to others. Try to have enough courage, love, under-

standing or faith to use the more efficient weapon, but if you do not or cannot acquire those qualities sufficiently, do not be a hypocrite. You will not help the world by violence, but truth to your inner self is more important because it is prerequisite to any advances whatever.

This matter of being true to oneself is connected with the attaining of a realization of spiritual unity with the universe, perhaps in the following way. Since truth is a divine quality, to know God to any degree requires a recognition and love of truth. To know the truth about the outside world, or to express truth to it, is exceedingly difficult. One can come nearer to an apprehension and an expression of truth within one's own self than in exterior ways. In order to be as nearly as possible true within and to know oneself as fully as possible, one must act as closely as possible in accord with one's inner attitude. Thus the thinking and knowledge approach completion and truth. A Sanskrit proverb says: "As with the individual, so with the universe," like Blake's doctrine of Minute Particulars quoted above. Therefore, if you want to be true in the great principles and relationships, you must first be true and sincere in the small ones

within yourself. While we must labor to make our inner attitude right, we must always be true to the light as we see it.

Some might take this to mean that all nations ought to continue to go to war because the majority of men still believe in violence. Not at all. The mere fact that a few hundred years ago all soldiers relied upon swords, spears, knives, arrows and clubs was no reason for not teaching them how to use guns. Moreover, the Great War proved beyond doubt that practically all men are endowed with amazing courage and faith. All that is needed to bring it out is wise understanding, courageous leadership and careful training, discipline and organization.

The same is true of non-violent resistance. Given understanding and courageous leaders and adequate training, discipline and organization, non-violent resistance will prove its efficiency and superiority over violence every time. For examples, we refer the reader to chapter VII.

In earlier chapters we have tried to show that non-violent resistance, despite the suggestion of its unfortunate English name, is not, in fact, negative to charac-

ter. But the explanation of that fact may here be considered. To help in the explanation we will for the moment call non-violent resistance by its more positive name of soul-force.

A movement that is relatively new in human history is somewhat sporadic and small in its appearance. Every living growing thing has to select certain elements from its environment for its nourishment. All selection involves choice of what is useful to the end in view, and a rejection of what cannot be used or is no longer useful. If the growth is very novel and strange to its environment, it will probably find relatively little that it can use, and much of its action is then a refusal. Yet the essence of its action is positive, although in quantity, most of it seems to be a negative rejection. The earth particles might complain of a plant that its life consisted largely of negative refusal to take what was there within reach. It is probably for some such reason as this that the movement of soul-force, so strange and new to the world, especially in the West, was given by the West a negative sounding name—non-violent resistance.

All physiological processes involve a

constant anabolism and katabolism, a rejection and assimilation. Rejection is all right provided that there is at the same time an acceptance of something else that is more fitting and useful. This dual process is only putting each element in its most fitting and useful place. What is waste and poison for me is useful to plants, which in return give me something more useful to my form of life.

This two-sided activity enters even into aesthetic creation. As A. N. Whitehead says,¹

"The creative process is a process of exclusion to the same extent that it is a process of inclusion. In this connection 'to exclude' means to relegate to irrelevance in the aesthetic unity, and 'to include' means to elicit relevance to that unity."

This reasoning also applies to economic non-co-operation or boycott which sometimes is a feature of non-violent resistance. There the choice or preference expressed is an economic one, usually in favor of indigenous products or of products made in a certain way.

Hence all creation has its negative aspect, but that does not entitle us to call the creative process negative in essence.

1. *Religion in the Making*—Macmillan, New York 1926, p. 113.

Non-violent resistance or soul-force is in essence positive and creative.

The reader of this chapter has been patient and persevering. If the reader is also practical, he or she may at this point be ready to say, "All this sounds beautiful, but it is based on nothing but an intangible idea, an assumption of a spiritual unity among mankind. I want progress, but I want something real like engines or electric lights." The answer to such a demand is that those tangible things, too, grew out of nothing but intangible ideas, such assumptions for example, as the Copernican theory, the wave theory of light, the theories of such men as Faraday, Henry, Ohm, Steinmetz in regard to electricity. As long as mankind insisted on persecuting and burning scientists for their theories—men like Roger Bacon, Galileo and others—it was very difficult to prove whether their theories were correct or not. So at present, those who believe in the theory of non-violent resistance are not being exactly encouraged. But they are going ahead. They are more fortunate than the early scientists, for they can use the very opposition to help prove the truth of the theory.

There are great areas of thought and

action which still remain to be explored in the practice of non-violent resistance. It will require very sensitive apprehension, keen and profound thought, courage, endurance, indomitable will and resolution, and much wisdom and love to test and prove these ways into the future. We cannot be dogmatic. But we must have faith enough to act. It is pioneering. We hope to win bright and happy regions for our children and perhaps even for ourselves.

Non-violent resistance makes unlimited demands upon the human spirit. To such demands the human spirit has a way of making its greatest response.

XIV

NON-VIOLENCE IN INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIPS

MOST people are ready to admit that courtesy and gentleness are highly desirable in most relationships and on most occasions, but they say that there are certain situations in private life in which force or violence not only has been used since time immemorial, but also is necessary, proper and beneficial. They cite the instances of thoroughly naughty children, delirious and violently insane people, savage drunkards, thieves, brutal men assaulting defenceless women or children, etc. How does the theory of non-violent resistance meet these hard cases?

Let us consider them in order.

Most intelligent people recognize that non-violence in dealing with children, both in the home and at school, is by far the wisest course of action. Yet many

still believe that with certain children or in certain situations, or at certain stages, punishment is the only remedy.

But the experience of children's probationary and delinquency courts indicate that punishment is never desirable even in the most difficult and apparently obstinate cases. The methods of sympathy, kindness and stimulus of such instincts as play, curiosity, team spirit, etc., are far more effective and permanent in getting good results. These require love, intelligence, aliveness, elastic spirits and a sense of humor on the part of parents and teachers, but if we are trying to have fine children and a finer world, we must learn to develop the qualities necessary for their creation. Punishment of children is always a sign of failure and weakness on the part of the older generation. The sooner we honestly admit that to the children, the sooner we will win their confidence and be able to progress with them.

The apparently instinctive pugnacity of children is probably largely due to an unconscious imitation of the repressed or subconscious violent attitudes and impulses of parents and other older people, and some angry attitudes, tones, words and actions of older people which are

not at all repressed. If babies at birth have only two instinctive fears, as Watson says, then they presumably are born with very few anger capacities also, and owe their subsequent ability in this direction to what they have learned from the people who trained them.

Parents who strongly feel their responsibility for their children's conduct may do well to realize that the particular civilization and customs in which they exist are not the only ones under which it is possible to live finely, and beautifully and wisely. There is an infinity of possible customs and of individuals and of individual adaptations to a given social environment. Such a loosening of rigid conceptions, together with a complete respect for the personality of the child, would help modify the actions of many parents.

As this is not a book on child education or the family, we cannot attempt an elaborate discussion of the advantages of non-violence toward children. Those who care to study the matter in detail can readily get suggestions from any public library.¹

1. To start the ball rolling, Bertrand Russell's book on education has some good discussion. Those who are psychologically minded will get good ideas in E. B. Holt's

In the chapters on the psychology of non-violent resistance, we stated that imitation and suggestion are most powerful when unconscious or subconscious. It is known that drunken people are very sensitive to suggestion, and that in many types of insanity the subconsciousness is peculiarly alert and sensitive. Many insane people seem to have an uncanny facility in perceiving the real purposes of those with whom they come in contact. This type of sensitiveness may prevail also in certain types of delirium.

All this would tend to suggest that real non-violent kindness would be a language which many cases of delirium, drunkenness and insanity would understand and respond to in more instances than is ordinarily believed. Certain specific occasions where non-violence was successful in handling such cases confirm this conclusion.¹ Probably there

The Freudian Wish and W. M. Marston's *Emotions of Normal People* previously cited. Also an essay by Sarah N. Cleghorn in *Pacifism in the Modern World*, by D. Allen, Doubleday Doran, New York, 1919. See also W. E. Hocking *Man and the State*, p. 313—Yale University Press. 1926.

1. See E. Richards—*The Test of Faith*—131 *Atlantic Monthly* 617; *The Arm of God*—pp. 56, 142—151, 157—159—Oliphants, Ltd., London. It is interesting to recall that Christ used non-violent methods when he dealt with an insane boy.

are countless other unrecorded instances. Doubtless there are certain types of mental degeneracy where the nervous integrations are so badly injured that they are incapable of making any response in kind to non-violent treatment. But they may be relatively few, and capable of unmistakable diagnosis and description.

It would be desirable for psychiatrists and physicians to make a long and careful study and description of all types of mental disease or disability in relation to the possibility and desirability of handling them by wholly non-violent or non-forceful methods. Too much is now left to the haphazard experience and hasty generalizations of nurses, wardens and others. Such information codified into rules and made a subject of intelligent instruction would be of immense assistance to hospitals, insane asylums, houses of correction, policemen, private nurses and physicians. Their use would serve to increase considerably the affection and respect of people for government and hospitals, and help also in the prompter curing of many patients.

We have not yet reached the place where forceful restraint is no longer needed, but by careful study it will be

possible, I am confident, to reduce its amount and frequency very considerably. What we most need is a sincere, persistent, intelligent effort to eliminate it entirely—to regard every obstacle thereto as an indication of our ignorance of human nature rather than as any inherent impossibility.

Violent defense against thieves and burglars arises out of our ideas about property and the possibility of the replacement of property. These we have discussed at some length in our chapters on economics, philosophy and politics. Most killings by thieves and other criminals are not strictly "in cold blood," but out of fear that the victim will somehow harm the criminal. But if the threatened victim is wholly unafraid, friendly, kind, generous and imaginative, there is exceedingly small chance of any physical injury being done. Such considerations indicate that it is eventually possible and practicable to forego violence entirely in this type of cases. It is part of the job of non-violent resisters to help bring such a state of affairs to pass. It will be for mankind as a whole a slow process, but there is no reason why the progress should not be steady, and sometimes and at some places, rapid.

Whether or not one who believes in non-violent resistance should ever sue or defend oneself in a court of law is a question for each person to work out for oneself. Some believe that the whole system of modern courts and law is a system of masked violence, with the police, prisons, and soldiers always in the background. Such people do not care to take part in such methods, and prefer to suffer financial and other losses rather than to take part in a civil suit at law. Most people do not agree with such ideas.

We now come to a crucial kind of case described by Professor Perry as follows:—¹

“To try out this principle.....one must imagine the greatest conceivable good attached with a deliberate intent to destroy it, or the greatest conceivable evil to be threatened with a deliberate and implacable intent to perpetuate it. One must suppose the success of the enemy to be probable if he is not resisted, and doubtful or capable of being retarded, if he is resisted. To test the principle vigorously one should conceive the good or evil at stake in such terms as to arouse one's deepest sentiments. It is life, or character, or social welfare, or the soul's salvation that is attacked; it is tyranny, or rape, or child murder, or hell fire that is threatened. What, then, shall one do?”

1. R. B. Perry—*The Free Man and the Soldier*—Scribners, New York, 1916, p. 129.

Let us consider the most difficult case, where peril is threatened not to oneself but to someone else who is dear and also defenseless, someone for whom one is responsible. We might call them trustee cases. Individual opinion about such cases varies considerably, but it is almost always definite and emphatic because it involves considerable personal feeling. For this very reason the cases deserve careful analysis. I set forth the various considerations as I see them, not intending them as dogmatic conclusions, but merely as data to add to that of the reader, as a starting point for his further consideration. I discuss them at some length partly because they are a severe test of the principle and partly because the careful consideration of them helps to illuminate the meaning and application of the idea.

Suppose a case where a lovely young girl of fine and spotless character is travelling with her father, and at a moment when her father's attention is called elsewhere, she is suddenly threatened with assault by a savage man, for example a Pathan, one of the fierce Afghan tribes near Northwestern India. Her father returns just as the Pathan is preparing to seize the girl. There are three possible courses open to the father. He may

attack the Pathan with violence so as to drive him away or kill him; he may be a coward and do nothing effective or even run away himself; or he may attempt non-violent resistance.

Let us consider the possibilities, probabilities and certainties under each course of action. Let us take the worst conduct first—where the father is a coward and does nothing to protect his daughter. It is necessary to consider all possibilities in all three cases in order to clarify our thinking and guide our feeling aright. We are discussing bed-rock principles and will, therefore, call a spade a spade.

The girl will almost surely be assaulted. She may become diseased or incapable of bearing children as a result. Even if not, the emotional and physical shock may stay with her and weaken her and make her abnormal, timid and unhappy for the rest of her life. It may even make her insane. If the Pathan carries her off and she is not rescued, she may be driven to prostitution or life in a harem. In that event, she would be exposed to all the shame, insults, degradation, poverty, wretchedness, and moral ruin in such a life.

The Pathan will satisfy his lust and

therefore be further harmed morally. His dominance by physical force will be successful—a further moral harm to him and his friends.

The father will have evaded his responsibility, dishonored his trust and become, by permission, a participator in the crime. His irresponsibility and cowardice will have been a grave moral injury to himself as well as to all others concerned.

The onlookers, if any, and those who hear about it later (other than friends of the Pathan), will be given a spectacle of successful evil might, and will therefore be frightened and morally harmed. They may want to join in violent pursuit of the Pathan, but perhaps the cowardice of the father will so disgust them or infect them that they will do little or nothing to help.

All this is thoroughly reprehensible and productive of evil to everyone.

With a sense of relief, let us now consider the action of the naturally "human" and brave father. He attacks the Pathan with all the strength and skill at his command, and with whatever weapons he has at hand. He desires to prevent the assault, and his natural anger probably makes him want to wound the

Pathan or kill him. If perchance he has little or no such anger at first, he is almost sure to generate it in the course of the struggle. Let us assume that the father thus succeeds in preventing the assault, and either wounds or kills the Pathan during the affray. What is the net result?

The moral wrongs of the assault and its probable and possible consequences are prevented. The girl will have received a powerful impression on her mind and emotions:—

(1) that her father was greatly afraid for her safety ;

(2) that she has cause to be afraid of men, if she is alone or among strangers;

(3) that her virtue or her life is more important than the life of a man, or of a particular kind of a man ;

(4) that her virtue (if she is old enough to understand such things even vaguely) is an external bodily affair, subject to harm from without or from certain specific acts, rather than being a matter of her inner attitude and spirit.

If the Pathan was harmed or killed, his family and friends will probably sooner or later seek revenge, either upon the father or upon the father's friends or people of his race. This may result in

more assaults, woundings, robberies, arson, or murders, especially if a feud starts. If the Pathan is alive and recovers, he will probably seek revenge himself, at the earliest opportunity. The feeling of revenge will remain even though it may be restrained by fear, and eventually it will find expression.

The father will naturally be somewhat apprehensive of such revenge and will take precautions against it, both for himself, the girl, and his family and their friends. He will naturally feel considerable indignation at the event and may seek to have the government exert punitive measures against the Pathan or the village from which he came. If the father killed the Pathan in the struggle, he will have that fact on his mind and heart together with the justification that it was done in the course of duty. He may not have wanted at first to kill the Pathan, but only to drive him away, and the killing became a necessity in the course of the struggle or was an accident. In that event, there will be more of a load of regret.

The onlookers, if any, or those who hear of the encounter, and who are not on the side of the Pathan, will now probably feel that right and justice have been

done. But they may also feel somewhat apprehensive about revenge by the Pathan's friends.

The results thus seem to be a mixture of good and evil. Most people doubtless would feel that the good outweighs the harm, and that the father's action was not only justifiable but wholly worthy of praise. For them the matter is settled.

But it is only fair to hear the views of the believers in non-violent resistance. I cannot say exactly what they would be, for not all non-violent resisters think exactly alike. I only can state one such possible attitude which seems consistent and understandable. It will at least serve as a basis for discussion.

Let us suppose that the father is a true non-violent resister. He may be either strong or weak physically, but he has ample courage and would have no hesitation in attacking the Pathan, no matter how powerful and well-equipped is the latter. He will gladly die in fighting to preserve his daughter's honor, health and future happiness.

This father's beliefs, however, are somewhat different from the run of men. He really believes that the spirit of God is "in" every creature, and "in" all

things, and can find understandable and self-conscious expression in all human beings.¹ He believes that his prime duty is to seek a recognition and understanding and realization of that spirit and the spiritual unity of all creatures, both by himself and all other people with whom he comes in contact. He tries to make that unity real in the daily details of life by acts which will be expressive and symbolic of unity and love. He tries to deal with all people as if they were sons and daughters of God, hoping thereby to arouse similar realization in their minds and hearts and also to increase his own understanding. He owes that duty and responsibility to all and every man, woman and child, whether they be his own family, friends, or strangers, whether of his own race, nationality and station in life or otherwise. He thinks that affection is a partial feeling, toward those who are by nature peculiarly near to us, but that love is to be shared with all. He recognizes that differences of race, nation, occupation, language, customs, etc., exist, but that in and behind and even by means of them, this common unity and love can be expressed and symbolized and made understandable.

1. See our chapters on philosophy.

He believes that everyone has the ability to understand this, through some sort of psychic or emotional means of communication, in spite of all ordinary external differences and barriers.

The non-violent father, we will suppose, also believes that the root or origin of both evil and virtue is within the heart; that it is a matter of inner attitude or spirit; that it is deeper even than intellectual apprehension. In this situation, therefore, he believes that the initial, essential evil is the motive of the Pathan. The expression of that by outward act in the form of an assault is secondary, even though that may begin another series of evils. The father also believes that fear and anger are evil because they act as strong obstacles to prevent those who feel them from recognizing this spiritual unity above mentioned, and from acting in accordance with that unity and love to all.

On these assumptions, what will the father who is a non-violent resister do?

He would, as I conceive the situation, jump between his daughter and the Pathan, showing by every action, look, tone of voice, words and posture, that he

wishes the Pathan to desist from his evil purpose; that he, the father, is ready to undergo any suffering, loss, and even death in order to prevent it; that he wishes no harm whatsoever to the Pathan and will not wound or injure him; that the desire in the heart of the Pathan is wrong because it means a violation of the principles of human unity and love; that such passion on the part of the Pathan is only temporary and wholly capable of restraint; that he, the father, is not afraid for himself nor even for the girl, because no-matter what happens to her body, her spirit is always within, always creative, always able to make matters right after every misfortune. He appeals to the better self of the Pathan. He assumes that there is a spark within the Pathan which can be fanned to life. He knows that this has happened many times with the wildest savages and even drunken raging mobs. If he believes in prayer, he will also pray, knowing that savages themselves believe in prayer and will understand him in so doing.

What would be the possible, probable and certain results of such action?

The heart and mind of the Pathan may be sufficiently moved so that he will desist from his attack, or if he carries off

the girl he may be moved later not to assault her but to return her unharmed. Such has often been the result in actual similar cases.¹

But even if the girl were assaulted and carried off, and subsequently were compelled to lead a life of shame as a prostitute, she would still have the spirit of God within her and be capable of self-realization and of loving kindness and actions expressing a sense of conscious unity with other creatures. That is to say, even prostitution is not the worst that can happen to the girl, and she may still reform. Numerous great spiritual leaders have recognized this. Mohammed tells of an adulteress who was forgiven because she gave water to a dog who was dying from thirst.² Christ said to the chief priests and elders, "The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you ;"³ and he told Mary Magdalene that her sins were forgiven because she loved much.⁴ Among the Indian saints, Kabir and Chaitanya both saluted the

1. See *The Test of Faith* by E Richards, 131 Atlantic Monthly, 617 Boston, U. S. A. ; *The Arm of God*—Oliphants, Ltd., London.

2. Lane-Pole—*Specches and Table Talk of Mohammed*—Golden Treasury Series, Macmillan.

3. Matt. 21 : 31

4. Luke 7: 37—50

divinity in fallen women and thereby enabled them to reform.

" Furthermore, by the non-violent resistance and pleading of her father, the girl will have had indelibly impressed on her mind and heart an ideal of self-sacrificing love and of respect and kindness to the spirit of even the lowest. This would be especially strong if the father was killed in her defense. Probably in the course of the struggle she would have been so moved by love for father that she would have rushed to the Pathan and begged him to do anything to her, if he would only spare her father's life. Surely such memories would do much to keep her heart pure, no matter what might happen to her body and material fortunes. Presumably a father who thoroughly believed in non-violent resistance would have influenced his children in this way by his conduct from the very beginning and thus strengthened the girl's character. Such strong character and clear vision would tend to prevent a girl from going insane from the shock of such an event.

When we consider the matter soberly and calmly we know that disease, poverty, hardships and childlessness are not spiritual evils in and of themselves. They may become an occasion of spiritual

evil only if our reaction to them is mistaken. Even a young girl may take them wisely if she has been rightly trained.

By the conduct of the father, the girl's courage and self-reliance will tend to be enhanced, and her fears and sense of weakness will be reduced.

As for the Pathan, he will not feel any ill-will or desire for revenge against the girl or against the father, if the father is still alive, nor against the girl's other relatives or friends. Neither will the Pathan's friends bear any ill-will. This will be true in any event, whether the Pathan desists from his evil intent or not. The chances for reform of the Pathan sooner or later are favorable.

If the father is wounded or even killed, his conduct will have been such as to restrain his friends from seeking revenge against the Pathans. If the girl has been abducted, they probably will seek to rescue her, but the probabilities of violence on their part are diminished.

Those who later hear of the matter, as well as any chance spectators of the struggle, will have been strongly influenced by the fearless but non-violent conduct of the father, so that they too will probly be more courageous, and more

ready to help in any attempted rescue of the girl.

Altogether, then, non-violent resistance would, provided it is done with ample courage and love, seem to result in less total evil and a greater probability of good than either of the other two lines of conduct. It is the only one which offers any hope of truly altering the original evil, namely, the evil motive of the Pathan. By tending to remove fear from all parties, it provides the most favorable circumstances for a realization by all of them of their ultimate unity and common humanity.

Many would disagree with the foregoing conclusion. It is a difficult problem with many complex factors which will be given different weights and values by different people and by different civilizations. To decide it requires one to strip away all ordinary considerations and get down to ultimate realities, just for instance as when people are shipwrecked at sea or cast away on a desert island. Under such circumstances all human beings seem worthy of equal treatment regardless of station, race or character, and if any are to die it must be by voluntary sacrifice.

For those who rely upon authority

for guidance, we note that the chief modern authority, Mr. Gandhi, has at different times held different opinions as to this case. He now holds, I believe, that the guardian may use violence to protect the ward. It is interesting to note that Christ used non-violent resistance in the only trustee case in which he was in a position of protector; namely, when they brought to him the woman taken in adultery and threatened to stone her.¹ Nor would he allow his disciples to use violence to protect him in the Garden of Gethsemane, for he sternly rebuked the disciple who began to use violence.² Although he pronounced woe against whoever should cause a child to stumble, he did not say that it was right to use violence against others in order to prevent such stumbling.³ In the Chinese Buddhist tradition we find the following fragment:—⁴ "He is my husband. I love and revere him with all my heart, and therefore am determined to share his fate. Kill me first,.....and afterwrds do to him as you list." In both the *Bhagavad Gita* and Lao Tsu, we find frequent strong

1. John 8: 3—11.

2. Matt. 26: 51—54; Luke 22: 50—51; John 18: 10—11.

3. Matt. 18: 6; Mk. 9: 42; Luke 17: 2.

4. Fo-pen-hing-tsih-king (Ch. 51.)

statements that the spirit is immanent in all creatures, the concept upon which the action of the non-violent resister is based. Many of the mediaeval Hindu and Christian saints and the early Quakers and others are in accord.

Of course, if the father does not truly believe in non-violent resistance or is lacking in courage enough to lose his life or to use such a weapon, but does have faith in guns, swords, fists or other material weapons, he should be true to himself and protect his daughter to the utmost that he is capable in accordance with his faith.

The trustee cases all assume that the struggle of the father or guardian is purely defensive. But maybe there is no such thing as purely defensive physical struggle between two human beings. Are we not all responsible to some degree for the degradation, poverty, and hard conditions of all other people, and their prejudice, greed, narrowness, selfishness, bitterness and other attitudes of mind and heart? Do we not support institutions, customs and ideas which injure others? And even within the narrow limits of a struggle between two people, the psychological interplay of feelings, attitudes and ideas, conscious and subconscious is so swift,

subtle and complex, and the inner attitude of most people today is so inclined to be dominating, angry or fearful, that no one can be utterly sure that the other man was wholly the aggressor and wholly in the wrong.

Aggression really arises the instant we assert our separateness from others in respect to things of the spirit. Therefore, unless there is an initial assumption of spiritual unity and action corresponding to it, there can be no such thing as a purely defensive struggle. Or, to say it in another way, the only defense which is not also aggression is the assertion of the spiritual unity of all men, by action as well as by thought and word.

There are doubtless some cases where violence would be right even for a courageous non-violent resister, but I think they are very few. It seems to me that the only conditions under which violence would be permissible to a courageous non-violent resister would be when he is acting in love for the person toward whom the violence is being used, and he has no anger or fear and is sure that he will have neither fear nor anger engendered in the course of his action. Also that it is certain that any fear or anger created by the violence in the mind or

heart of other persons will be only momentary. It is not the external action which counts, but the fear, anger or other divisive feeling or attitude which almost inevitably accompanies violence, and of which the violent act is almost always a reliable indication.

But I have said enough, I trust, to make reasonably clear the application of the principle.

HYGIENIC AND ECOLOGICAL
ASPECTS

PHYSIOLOGICALLY the function of fear and anger seems to be to prepare the body for action in the nature of flight or fight. This preparation includes the integration and stimulus of the entire body, the brain, the nerves controlling the voluntary muscles, the sympathetic nervous system, and the activity of various glands, including the thyroid, the adrenals, and the liver, which throw into the blood-stream substances which help to form energy.¹ And as ideas are largely in the nature of plans or patterns for possible conduct, fear and anger affect the mind also. In one aspect, fear

1. See G. W. Crile, M. D.—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*—W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia, 1915; W. B. Cannon, M. D.—*Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage*—D. Appleton, New York, 1927; Cf. W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*—previously cited. Also A. F. Shand—*The Foundations of Character*, pp. 250-251, cited in Chap. II.

and anger may be regarded as states of transition from a less intense to a more intense level of activity.¹

In all animal life and in the long early ages of the history of man, while he was but little more than a hunting animal, most of the dangers which confronted the organism were of a sort which required immediate motor response, either flight or fight. Through all this long evolutionary period, therefore, fear and anger were of immense value in helping to conserve the species. This long period of exercise also established these reactions as firm habits.

But nowadays, fear and anger are not as useful or necessary to mankind as they were formerly. Man's knowledge of nature and its possible perils has enormously increased, and with it his control of most of the situations in which he finds himself. His invention of tools and chemical and electrical appliances has immensely increased his ability to perceive and act at a distance. His discovery of coal, oil and electricity has given him vast sources of power. His foresight has lengthened. His intellectual ability to solve problems involving danger to

¹ I. W. E. Hocking—*Morale and Its Enemies*—pp. 155-156, Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A., 1918.

him has greatly increased. His economic, social and political organization has become much more close and complex and massive. All this has resulted in very largely abolishing the old dangerous situations which were best met by instantaneous motor response. Instead, we meet perils which usually gather more slowly and are so complex that there is no immediate instinctive motor response which can cope with them effectively. Such present-day enemies are psychological or economic failure, disease, poverty, social losses, etc. Caution, foresight and intellectual powers are far more effective against such dangers than physical flight or combat could be. Human energy is needed but less muscular and more intellectual and moral.

Purely muscular energy is not so much needed by mankind as formerly, for various reasons. For his food, man no longer relies on the chase, but on farming; and in farming he has various tools and machines which relieve him of much labor. Coal, oil, water power and electricity now provide a very large part of the motive power of the world. In every nation and tribe there are now systems of group activity and organization and division of labor which reduce

the total amount of bodily motor activity necessary to maintain life. The growth of population, and developments of transport, communication, commerce and financial credit have made the factors of co-operation and group relationship and integration much more important to the life of the race. Thus bodily activity has gradually become less important and factors of intellect and sentiment and co-operation have become more important in relation to the survival and progress of mankind.

Since sudden and intense muscular activity has become less exclusively important, the chief emotional stimuli and preparations for such activity—namely, fear and anger—have also become less necessary and valuable to mankind.

Furthermore, man seems now to have reached a stage in his history where fear and anger are not merely less important but have become a positive detriment. They have become hygienically bad for the individual and the race. Let us consider the evidence in support of this conclusion.

Eminent physiologists tell us that fear and anger are the most exhausting of the emotions, and are even more

exhausting than actual bodily labor. Dr. George W. Crile, the great American Surgeon, writes :—¹

“ Fear arose from injury, and is one of the oldest and surely the strongest emotion.....The mechanism by which the motor acts are performed and the mechanism by which the emotions are expressed are one and the same.....Because fear was created by trauma (injury), fear causes a discharge of the energy of the nervous system by the law of phylogenetic association.....It was previously stated that under the stimulus of fear animals show preternatural strength. An analysis of the phenomena of fear shows that, as far as can be determined, all the functions of the body requiring the expenditure of energy, and which are of no direct assistance in the effort toward self-preservation are suspended. In the voluntary expenditure of muscular energy, as in the chase, the suspension of other functions is by no means so complete. Fear and trauma may drain to the last dregs the dischargeable nervous energy, and, therefore, the greatest possible exhaustion may be produced by fear and trauma.”

Cannon showed that the physiological processes and results of anger and fear are exactly the same.² Hence Crile's remarks about fear apply to anger also.

Crile's later researches lead him to still stronger statements. In his book

1. *loc. cit.* pp. 30, 52, 59, 75.

2. *loc. cit.*

*A Physical Interpretation of Shock*¹ he says:—

“Emotion causes a more rapid exhaustion than is caused by exertion, or by trauma, except extensive mangling of the tissue, or by any toxic stimulus except the perforation of the viscera.”

Cannon, in a most interesting and conclusive fashion, proved that in both anger and fear there is complete suspension of all the activities of the entire digestive tract, no secretion of digestive juices and no muscular activity, and that this practical paralysis may last for several hours after the emotion is felt, if it was intense.² This, if frequently repeated, is, of course, very detrimental to the digestive system. Crile says:—

“In our experiments, fear caused profound changes in the cells of the brain, the liver and the adrenals; in some cases the blood was acutely acidosed; in some cases albumen and sugar appeared in the urine; the adrenalin output, as has been demonstrated by Cannon, was increased; the electric conductivity of the brain, the liver, and of other organs, was altered.”³

Cannon proved that in fear and anger

1. Oxford Medical Publication, Oxford University, Press, London, 1921, pp. 60, 65.

2. loc. cit.

3. *A Physical Interpretation of Shock*, p. 63, above cited.

there is an increase of adrenalin and of sugar in the blood. He and Crile and others also showed that adrenalin in the blood causes increased metabolism, increased thyroid activity, increased blood pressure, increased pulse, increased respiration, leucocytosis, increased sweating, dilation of the pupils, diversion of blood to the surface of the body and increased brain activity.

In modern life, although there are many occasions which serve to arouse fear or anger in more or less intense forms, there is relatively little opportunity among adults to express them by combat or running away. Hence there probably tends to be in the blood of many people an excess of adrenalin and sugar which does not get worked off by physical exertion. For instance, Cannon experimentally tested the blood of all the students in one of his classes in the medical school, then announced that he would give them a stiff examination and let them worry about it for a few hours, and then tested their blood again. In all of them he found an increase of sugar in their blood. This indicates that the lesser forms of fear and anger, such as anxiety, worry, apprehension, irritation, annoyance and vexation create results

which are the same in quality though less intense than those of acute fear and anger.

Both Cannon and Crile produce evidence to show that if the excessive adrenalin and blood-sugar produced by fear and anger are not consumed by action, they cause physical injury to the body.¹ It appears that this physical injury is largely in the nature of an acidosis—an increased hydrogen-ion concentration of the blood and a decreased alkaline reserve.² Chronic or frequent anxiety or irritation also create dyspepsia and other digestive diseases, because of the inhibitory effect above described.

Elsewhere³ Crile states that the maintenance of the normal slightly alkaline reaction of the body is of very great importance; that "acidosis is a factor in many diseases—acute and chronic" . . . and suggests "that the

1. Cannon, *loc. cit.* p. 196; Crile—*Origin and Nature of the Emotions*—p. 64; W. B. Cannon and D. de la Paz—*The Stimulation of Adrenalin Secretion by Emotional Excitement*—*Journal of American Medical Association*, Mar. II, 1911.

2. Crile—*A Physical Interpretation of Shock*, pp. 63, 83, 86.

3. G. W. Crile—*Man—An Adaptive Mechanism*—Macmillan, N. Y. 1916.

ultimate cause of death is usually acidosis." It would seem that increased hydrogen-ion concentration in the blood and decreased alkaline reserve tend to lower the immunity of the body toward germ diseases, and also weaken certain tissues and organs such as the kidneys, heart and other blood vessels.

The hypothesis that fear and anger in various degrees of intensity are an important factor predisposing to disease would help explain the influenza epidemic in 1918, after a considerable period of anxiety and hatred due to the war and further anxieties of economic origin. It would partly account for the higher disease rates among the very poor who suffer so much from anxiety, especially in such poverty-stricken countries as India and China. It would help explain the diseases of childhood, the time of emotional strains due to the growth of self-consciousness and adaptations to other people and new situations. It would help explain the rise in the death rate from heart disease, hardening of the arteries, and kidney diseases in Western civilized countries where the strains of modern life are so great and where there is so much sedentary life. It might be shown that other great epidemics were

preceded by periods of economic hardship or insecurity or by severe wars.

The above described medical researches give good professional authority in support of Nietzsche's conclusion, quoted in Chapter XVII, that Buddha's principle of avoiding anger was sound hygiene. They indicate that non-violent resistance is a "manipulative activity" of very great hygienic importance both to individuals and to the human race. The first nation to adopt it in thorough-going fashion—making it a discipline for all phases of national, group and private life—would probably soon be rewarded with a remarkable improvement in its public health.

Thus, although fear and anger were once efficient energizers of the sort needed to meet the perils of life in the early history of mankind, they have now, because of the great change in our conditions, probably become not only inefficient but positively detrimental. There is good ground for believing that now they are no longer biologically efficient emotions, and should no longer be considered normal.¹

1. See W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*—pp. I-3 and Chap. I7, previously cited. Cf. W. A. White—*Outlines of Psychiatry*—7th ed., paragraph on Morbid

It is of course true that men and animals who possess extraordinary dominance power often permit some of this power to break over and be wasted in anger. Such people often succeed over weaker opponents, but they succeed not because of their anger, but in spite of it and because of their superior dominance. The anger is always a waste and handicap.¹ The fact that anger is perhaps the deepest and most persistent of the emotions does not prove that it is now the most important, but may rather argue that it is the least 'intelligent' of them all.² Anger short circuits too much energy into friction and purely bodily channels, and because of its blinding and confusing effect on the mind, it misdirects too large a part of the total supply of human energy. The economics of energy must include all human energy.

It appears in the present stage of man's progress that love, such as occurs in true non-violent resistance, is a more efficient method of arousing, sustaining and guiding energy than is either fear or anger. This is a repetition, from another

Anger,—Nervous and Mental Diseases Publ. Co., Washington, D. C. 1919.

1. Marston p. 365

2. Marston pp. 119-120, 364 *et seq.*

angle of approach, of what we stated in Chapters IV and XII as to the creative power of love.

Moreover, inasmuch as the nervous integrative mechanism of man has not changed for the past 10,000 years or more, it would appear that all kinds of men now on earth, from the most savage tribes to the most civilized nations, except perhaps certain types of mentally diseased persons, are capable of responding to non-violent kindly treatment. This is further indicated by the fact that savages have responded favourably and promptly to non-violent resistance.¹

We have been waiting for sufficient social experience to make it possible for leaders possessed of unusual insight and wisdom to realize the truth of non-violent resistance. Such men as Buddha, Lao Tsu, Christ, Gandhi and others have seen it and practised it. All that remains is for the rest of mankind to take up this instrument, practise it and perfect it.

1 See instances cited by William James'—*Varieties of Religious Experience*—Longmans Green, 1902, p. 359 ; C. M. Case—*Non-Violent Coercion*—pp. 242-248, Century Co., New York, 1923; Adin Ballou—*Christian Non-Resistance*—pp. 146-169, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, 1910 ; See also *The Arm of God*, Oliphants, Ltd., London ; *The Test of Faith* by E. Richards, Vol. 131, Atl. Monthly p. 617.

We are all capable of using it if we will only try hard enough. Our facilities of physical power, organization, credit, language, scientific knowledge, etc., are now such that fighting and violence are no longer necessary for either security or for the right kind of power or biological fitness. The customary expressions of pugnacity are no longer useful to the human species. It is time for pugnacity to be transformed, just as many rudimentary instincts have been transformed, and its energies sublimed and used for creative ends.¹

Some say that war is biologically

I For further consideration of the alteration of instincts and of this instinct in particular, see Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*—p. 57, previously cited; Trotter—*Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*—pp. 124-127, previously cited; A. M. Carr-Saunders—*Biology and War*—'Foreign Affairs,' New York, Apr. 1929, pp. 427-438; W. B. Cannon, *loc. cit.* pp. 286-290; W. S. Walsh—*The Inferiority Feeling*—E. P. Dutton, New York, 1928, p. 340-343; Nietzsche—*Ecce Homo* Sec. 6; *Nietzsche and the Aristocratic Ideal*—by A. K. Rogers, 30 Int. J. of Ethics, 450, Oct. 1919; W. E. Hocking—*Human Nature and its Remaking*, Ch. I—previously cited; John Dewey—*Human Nature and Conduct*—H. Holt, New York, 1922; W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*—previously cited; G. W. Crile, *A Mechanistic View of War and Peace*—Macmillan, New York; 1915; Rivers—*Psychology and Politics*, Ch. II—Harcourt Brace, New York, and Kegan Paul, London, 1923; Benjamin Kidd—*The Science of Power*, Ch. X—Putnams, New York and London, 1918; M. W. Calkins—*Militant Pacifism*—28 International J. of Ethics, 70.

necessary as a means of selection, and biologically inevitable because the instinct of pugnacity cannot be altered. They say that any attempt to suppress this instinct would be psychologically harmful to the individual and the race. But careful study shows that of all the vertebrates man is the only one which indulges in organized mass fighting to the death against his own species, and that war is not a biological phenomenon but a human custom.¹ Furthermore, it needs but a moment's consideration to realize that every single instinct in mankind has undergone immense alterations and sublimations. For example, the whole art and training of war is a profound and complete alteration and discipline of the emotion of fear and the instinct of flight.

Self-defense and self-preservation have come to mean the defense and preservation of the larger self, or of the race-self. Non-violent resistance is put forward as the best substitute for pugnacity. The use of non-violent resistance will result in better individual and public health as well as better political, economic and social life.

1 A. M. Cair-Saunders—*Biology and War*—vol. 7
"Foreign Affairs" p. 437, April 1929, New York.

As Lotka says:¹ "The life contest is primarily a competition for available energy." Fulness of life requires an increase of energy flowing through mankind, individually and as a species. We have seen that the total solar energy reaching the earth is far beyond the needs of mankind. We know that only by close co-operation can man increase his utilization of solar energy, and that this applies to large groups as well as the smallest group (the family). War and violence and divisive attitudes spell eventual biological suicide. It might be argued that a person who uses non-violent resistance and gets killed while so doing is a biological failure. Not so, for by his example and influence, he has increased the knowledge and skill of humanity in regard to this weapon and increased the probability of its further use. This is of great value to the survival of the human race.

It may be shown that many sorts of repression or thwarting of satisfaction of normal instincts and desires result in forms of anxiety or irritation (fear or anger). The free play of normal instincts and desires in individual and group life

1. A. J. Lotka—*Elements of Physical Biology*—Willams & Wilkins, Baltimore, U. S. A., pp. 351, 355.

is one definition of liberty. Thus the attaining of political and economic and social liberty is attaining control by groups and individuals over the means of satisfying their normal instincts and needs. Since lack of liberty creates fear and anger, and fear and anger help to create disease, liberty is synonymous with health.¹ Non-violent resistance thus becomes a very precious instrument for the service of man.

Let us now consider one further aspect of the matter.

For many years Western people have laughed and sneered at vegetarians and at the Buddhist and Hindu idea that we ought to show gentleness to all living organisms—animals, insects and plants.

But a larger view of the matter may show that these Westerners are mistaken. This larger view is found in part in the newly-developing science of ecology and the well known facts of symbiosis.

Ecology is the study of the relation of plants, insects and animals, including man, to their environment in its widest sense, and the mutual effect of environ-

1. See address by Leland Olds, Ph. D., entitled *Health and the Labor Movement*, Proceedings of the International Conference of Women Physicians, Vol. II, p. 21., The Woman's Press, New York, 1920.

ment and organism. Symbiosis has been defined as "a mutually beneficial internal partnership between two organisms of different kinds," such as exists between mankind and cattle, or between certain fungi and the roots of other plants or trees. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica,¹ animal ecology includes "a knowledge of the means by which the numbers of animals are controlled, or of the factors in the environment which affect the life histories and distribution of the various species." Ecology promises to be a very important aid, it says, in "solving some of the urgent practical problems which are cropping up everywhere as a result of man's becoming civilized and interfering with the animal and plant life around him."

A brief statement of two problems in ecology and their solution will show its bearing on our subject.

A few years ago in one of the districts of England, white clover, which had previously flourished, almost disappeared in a very few years, without apparent reason. After careful investigation the following chain of causation was worked out. The white clover depended for its propagation upon the

1. 14th ed., 1929, article on Ecology.

fertilization of its blossoms by bumble bees. Bumble bees have their nests in the ground. Among the enemies of the bumble bees are field mice who dig into the bumble bee nests and eat the honey and perhaps the grubs. Before the failure of the clover, the field mice had been kept in check by numerous cats. For some reason hunters and farmers began to shoot the cats on a large scale. As a result the field mice increased very rapidly; the bumble bees almost disappeared; and thereupon the white clover failed.

Another case is taken from the Encyclopedia Britannica.¹

Of late years the willow grouse has been getting increasingly scarce in Norway.

"It appears that.....until about 1900 the willow grouse used to be subject to very marked and at the same time very regular fluctuations in numbers, and that one of the factors producing this was a.....protozoan.....which gave rise to epidemics among the willow grouse whenever the latter became overcrowded....In recent years the epidemics in grouse have become much more frequent and severe so that the population is kept permanently at a very low ebb.....(The explanation of this state of affairs is this: normally the number of

1. 14th ed., article on Ecology,

sick individuals in the coveys of willow grouse is kept down by birds of prey, for the heavy infestation by the parasite has the effect of reducing the flying power of birds, so that the sick are more easy to catch than the healthy. In this way the proportion of heavily infected birds, even in epidemic periods, was always kept below a certain level ; but in recent years birds of prey have been persecuted and greatly reduced in numbers, owing to the damage they do to poultry, etc., on farms. In consequence it seems that the ground occupied by the willow grouse has become very heavily infected with the spores of that protozoan, and the density of the parasites has increased to such a point that the grouse have an epidemic nearly every year, instead of every four years. Besides being interesting in other ways, this example illustrates how the obvious idea of enemies being hostile to their prey fails to hold good when we are dealing with the regulation of numbers. Here the hawks were by their actions increasing the density of the willow grouse, instead of merely tending to reduce it. ”

These two examples show how very complex is the balance of life in nature, and how one relatively slight disturbance may cause very marked changes in other forms of life which are connected perhaps by a long “ food-chain ” or cycle of symbiosis. The multiplicity of many species of animals, insects and plants constitutes a factor of elasticity in the constantly moving balance of life. Man's ruthless interference with nature has

often come back upon his own head with terrible effect. Probably the great floods in China are due to the deforestation in the mountains. The great insect crop-pests and plant diseases in the United States are probably largely due to sudden changes in types and density of vegetation by modern farming. Indeed it sometimes seems as if man had ceased to be on terms of symbiosis with Nature and had become merely a destructive parasite upon Nature.

“ Man and his environment are not two separate entities or closed systems unrelated or only indirectly related to each other ; the development and evolution of man as a life-bearing, open energy system, must necessarily include all related systems, inorganic, organic, and social : for man, in a very literal and real sense, is a part of Nature and his development whether physiological, sociological or economic is but a part of the great process of Nature ; so that it is not the organism alone or the species that evolves, but the entire system ; ‘ a fit organism inhabits a fit environment ! ’ ”¹

These considerations suggest that what the Hindus call *Ahimsa* (gentleness and kindly consideration) toward all plants, insects and animals, as well as toward mankind is a method of sound symbiosis and ecology, of profound import-

1. Wm. A. White, M. D — *The Meaning of Disease*—Williams Wilkins, Baltimore, U. S. A., 1926.

ance in relation to the survival of mankind over a long period of years.¹

The foregoing example of the willow grouse does not support the idea of the value of promiscuous killing. The hawks were only securing the food which they were by nature dependent upon, as man is dependent on plants, or in the Arctic regions, upon meat of animals. Rather the story indicates that man, by providing unusual quantities of unprotected poultry, tempted the hawks. The hawks then became a pest and got slain and their decrease caused a decrease in the willow grouse, this in turn causing probably some unknown further disturbance.

Similarly, man, by allowing his houses, his streets or his clothes to become dirty, or allowing garbage, waste, etc., to lie around, or permitting undrained water pools, provides or permits food and breeding and living places for rats, flies, mosquitoes, fleas, lice, and other vermin thereby bringing upon himself all sorts of disease, poverty and hardships. Cleanliness means the right thing in the right place. Life springs up everywhere, and man may largely control the kind of

1. The Hindu concept involves much more than this and that is beyond the limits of our discussion.

life it will be, provided he will humbly learn from Nature.

The way of non-violent resistance is for man to begin with himself, clean up, learn knowledge about other creatures and about food, air, sunlight and sleep and thus purify himself and control his environment by controlling himself.

It appears, then, that truth and gentle kindness, the two essential elements of non-violent resistance, are probably of vital importance for the survival of mankind.¹

1. See also the remainder of the article on Ecology, and the ecology sections of the article on Plants and the article on Symbiosis in the 14th ed. of *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1929); J. Macleod—*The Struggle for Existence and Mutual Aid*—16 *Hibbert Journal*, 206, 1917; A. M. Carr-Saunders—*The Population Problem*—Oxford University Press, London, 1922; L. Dublin, editor—*Population Problems in the U. S. and Canada*—Houghton & Mifflin, Boston, U. S. A., 1926; Julian Huxley—*Essays of a Biologist*—Chatto and Windus, London, 1928; A. S. Pearse—*Animal Ecology*—1926; R. N. Chapman—*Animal Ecology*—Minneapolis, U. S. A., 1926; Elton—*Ecology* and other books cited in article on Ecology in *Encycl. Brit.*

XVI

SOME AUTHORITIES FOR VIOLENCE

THE argument of this book is not based on the authority of any one or two men, nor even on the thinking of pacifists or non-violent resisters alone. We have derived it from a great body or stream of ideas of many kinds of men, including even the militarists. Our authority is the carefully sifted experience of the whole human race. We have tried to avoid citing Krishna, Buddha, Lao Tsu, Christ, Fox, Tolstoi, Gandhi and similar persons as authority for our conclusions. Such quotations as we have made from them have been chiefly by way of illustration. We do not so much believe that non-violent resistance is true because some one or all of these authorities proclaimed it, as that those authorities proclaimed it because it is true.

Nevertheless, many people prefer to select their leader and guide and then

follow that person and cite his words as authority for their acts and convictions. As this book is not a history, we cannot attempt even to name all the many great advocates and opponents of non-violent resistance. There are a number, however, whose ideas, or some of whose ideas, raise doubts as to the validity of our general thesis, and yet who are so important as to require separate consideration outside of chapter VIII.

The authorities we propose to consider are Lenin, Trotsky, Nietzsche, Mohammed, the *Bhagavad Gita* and Christ. We will also discuss some apparent inconsistencies in Gandhi's record. The influence of the first three of these has been very strong for war. Their ideas must be squarely faced and dealt with by every non-violent resister who wants to have a sound intellectual foundation for his convictions. In the words of Mohammed, the *Bhagavad Gita* and Christ, there are certain apparent ambiguities and inconsistencies which have been a source of doubt and difficulty to thinkers upon this topic.

I am not a scholar; but sometimes an amateur, just because of his newness to a subject, has an unconventionality or different point of view that enables him

to notice features that are important but have been overlooked because of their very familiarity or some other reason. For example, some recent archeological discoveries in England and Central America have been made not by archeologists but by aviators, whose view enabled them to see the outlines of old barrows, mounds and ruins, not visible to those on the ground. So although I am not a scholar, I have given some time and thought to non-violent resistance and have been very fortunate in my teachers of this subject. For these reasons, I may presume to try to help others who are seeking to understand it, too.

Let us first consider the two great vigorous modern opponents of pacifism, Lenin and Trotsky. Of the two, Trotsky has argued out the question in greater detail, but both are full of vitriolic scorn for all pacifists.

Perhaps the most vigorous and searching criticisms of pacifism in Lenin's writings and speeches are to be found in his essays, *The State and Revolution*¹

1. Published by the Socialist Labor Party of Great Britain, and the Communist Party of Great Britain, London, and by the Marxian Educational Society, Detroit, U. S. A. The page references are to the American Edition.

(1917) (pp. 21-23, 93-94), *Armaments and War*,¹ *The Causes of the World War* (speech, Aug. 23, 1918);² and a paper in *The Social-Democrat*, No. 39, Nov. 11, 1914. Further quotations from him and illuminating description and comment on this topic will be found in the biographies of him by Trotsky, Zinoviev, Rhys-Williams and Fulop Miller.³

Trotsky's brilliant and slashing analytical attacks are best in his *Defense of Terrorism*,⁴ *Where is Britain Going*, Chapter V,⁵ and his essay on *Democracy, Pacifism and Imperialism*.⁶

The Communists do not worship war as Bernhardt and a few others did. They look upon it as a terrible, inevitable, his-

1. Pages 137-141 of *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, by N. Lenin and L. Trotsky, ed. by L. C. Fraina, The Communist Press, New York, 1918.

2. *Voices of Revolt*—V. I. Lenin, International Publishers, New York, 1928; see also collection of his speeches published by International Publishers, New York.

3. *Lenin* by L. Trotsky—Minton Balch, New York, 1925; *Lenin* by A. Rhys-Williams, Scott & Seltzer, New York, 1919; *Lenin and Gandhi*—by Rene Fulop-Miller—G. P. Putnam's Sons, London and New York, 1927.

4. Allen & Unwin, London, 1921: published in America under the title of *Dictatorship vs. Democracy* by The Workers Party of America, New York, 1922.

5. Allen & Unwin, London, 1926.

6. In *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, edited by L. Fraina, above cited.

torical necessity, but they are so determined to win their objective of proletarian dominance that they grasp the weapon of violence and use it to the utmost and without any qualms. Yet they hope finally for peace.

Lenin is quoted by Fulop-Miller¹ as saying that "it was 'a hellishly hard task' to execute people, 'ruthlessly to split skulls open,' while the ultimate political ideal was, on the other hand, the fight against violence." In his essay on *Armaments and War*,² Lenin says, "Only after we have completely forced down and expropriated the *bourgeoisie* of the whole world and not of one country alone, will wars become impossible." And again,....."Only after the disarmament of the *bourgeoisie* by the proletariat can the latter, without betraying its world historical task, throw armaments on the scrap heap, and it will do this, but not till then." In that same essay he spoke of "armament of the proletariat. . . . as the only possible tactic prepared by, based on and forced upon us by the objective development of capitalistic militarism."

Lenin evidently believed that spo-

1. P. *Lenin and Gandhi*, cited above.

2. *Loc. cit.* pp. 137, 138

radic, undisciplined violence was folly. When his older brother was executed for complicity in an attempt to bomb the Czar of Russia, Lenin said, according to his sister, "No, we cannot succeed in this way, it is not the right way."¹

In *The State and Revolution* (pp. 93-94), he says:—

"Only in the Communist Society, when the resistance of the capitalists has finally been broken, when the capitalists have disappeared, when there are no longer any classes (that is, when there is no difference between the members of society in respect to their social means of production) *only then* 'does the State disappear and one can speak of freedom' And only then will democracy itself begin to wither away in virtue of the simple fact that, freed from capitalist slavery, from the innumerable horrors, savagery, absurdities and infamies of capitalist exploitation, people will gradually *become accustomed* to the observation of the elementary rules of social life, known for centuries, repeated for thousands of years in all sermons. They will become accustomed to their observance without force, without constraint, without subjection, without the *special* apparatus for compulsion which is called the State."

From this it appears that Lenin thought of the revolution of the working classes as a war to end war.

¹ See p. 46 of *Lenin and Gandhi* by R. Fulop-Miller, above cited.

Many careful observers have noticed the close inter-connection and similarity between the methods and attitudes of capitalism and those of war.¹ Lenin agreed. In one of his essays in *The Social Democrat* (No. 39, Nov. 11, 1914) he wrote:

"War is not an accident nor a sin as the Christian popes (who like all opportunists preach patriotism, humanitarianism and pacifism) believe ; but an inevitable part of capitalism, as legitimate a form of capitalistic life as peace."

Again in his *Armaments and War* above cited, he wrote,

"It would be absolutely wrong, theoretically, to forget that every war is a continuation of politics by other means : the present imperialistic war is the continuation of the imperialistic policy originating and developing under the conditions of the epoch of Imperialism."

The same idea is woven through the background of many of Trotsky's writings. Also those of Marx.

Let us state it thus :—War and capitalism have very similar psychological roots and character.² J. M. Keynes, one of the ablest protagonists of capitalism

1 See our preceding chapter on Economic Aspects and the first footnote therein.

2 Cf. pp. 83-85 and 129-132 of T. Burrow—*The Social Basis of Conscientiousness*—Kegan Paul, London and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927.

says in effect that greed is the essence of capitalism.¹ Greed is in one sense an inverted fear, an attempt to provide against a possible insecurity. Fear and greed are roots of war as well as of capitalism. As we have seen from our psychological and philosophical chapters, both fear and greed are divisive motives or attitudes.

Capitalism provides the materials and credit for modern war. Modern war produces immense profits for capitalism. Modern war requires huge industrial establishments. Each helps the other. War is often waged for economic motives. Capitalism and war both regard and treat men merely as means to ulterior and selfish ends of those more powerful. Capitalism is not the sole cause of war, for wars existed before capitalism. War is the elder brother, but both are in the same family, children of the same fundamental attitudes or assumptions about life. The two brothers help each other. Both have the same ideology of compulsion and ruthlessness,

1. In his *The End of Laissez-Faire* (Hogarth Press, London, 1926), he defines the principle of capitalism as "the dependence upon an intense appeal to the money-making and money-loving instincts of individuals as the main motive of the economic machine."

the same unconscious assumptions and motives of divisiveness.

If this be so, it would seem not only that war is an inevitable result and accompaniment of capitalism, but that, now that both are so mature, capitalism would be an inevitable result and accompaniment of war. That is to say, if the workers elect to use war to attain their ends, they will eventually be sucked into the whirlpool of capitalism again, or to change the metaphor, become emmeshed in its toils. Can this be one reason why the Soviets had to adopt the New Economic Policy, a partial compromise with and reversion to capitalism? Will they not for this reason be driven still further toward some form of capitalism—maybe State capitalism?

War involves a belief in human separateness, divisiveness and disunity. The Communists profess to be aiming at an ultimate human unity. But Trotsky himself says that "who aims at the end cannot reject the means."¹ It is impossible to attain unity through divisive means, as we endeavored to show in our chapter on philosophy.

If this be true, war or violence is one

1. *Dictatorship vs. Democracy*,—American edition, above cited, p. 22.

line of tactics that the proletariat, aiming to create a better world, must rigidly reject. To indulge in it would be to support capitalism. It would even operate to subjugate and ruin such labor organizations as admire and openly support capitalism. Their own experience ought to teach them that. It is true that another great war would probably put an end to many of the forms and institutions of Western civilization, but that does not prove that capitalism in a new form would not rise Phoenix-like from the holocaust.

When the Soviets signed the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk with Germany, many of the Bolsheviks thought this was a mistake, arguing that to make an agreement with imperialistic Germany would be a breach of the principles of international Socialism and would make Russia an aid and agent of German Imperialism. But Lenin pointed out that, "those who call the war with Germany a righteous and defensive war are the real betrayers of Socialism, because they are in reality supporting French and English Imperialism and concealing the secret treaties from the people."¹

1. N. Lenin—*Why Soviet Russia Made Peace*—p. 357 of *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia*, above cited.

This seems analogous to our present question. It seems to me that, despite their honesty and utter devotion to the workers, the advocates of proletarian violence against capitalists may be the real (though unconscious) betrayers of the workers, for in so doing they are supporting in themselves and in all classes, the fundamental inner attitude which nourishes and produces capitalism as its economic expression. That the Communists are wholly sincere and devoted to the workers, I do not doubt for an instant, but nevertheless, I believe that their mistake in respect to violence is inimical to the cause of the workers. I realize that they sincerely believe that violence is the road to freedom. I differ, no less sincerely, I trust.

Trotsky says,

“Only by breaking the will of the armies thrown against it can the revolutionary class solve the problem of power—the root problem of every revolution.”¹

If Trotsky is referring to material power, he is mistaken. Material power is not the root problem of every revolution. The root problem lies deeper. It consists of an inner attitude, and ideas

1. *Dictatorship vs. Democracy*—American ed. p. 25, above cited.

and beliefs resulting from that attitude. That inner attitude and its assumptions are partly subconscious. Non-violent resistance affects and re-creates that attitude largely through its effect on the subconsciousness of the opponents and onlookers, as explained in our chapters on psychology.

I believe that class divisions cannot be ended by strife, nor by destroying the material power of the class in control, but only by changing their ideology, their assumptions upon which the controlling class greed is based.

It is the contention of the Communists that the capitalists cannot be reformed without force; that they will never forego their power without intimidation and violence. Trotsky reports that Lenin told H.G. Wells that "capitalism of to-day is incurably greedy and destructive and that it cannot be taught."¹ And Trotsky wrote of his opponent Kautsky,

"We will find in history no other way of breaking the class will of the enemy except the systematic and energetic use of violence."²

Also in the same chapter,

1. p. 181 of *Lenin* by L. Trotsky, above cited.
2. p. 55 of *Dictatorship vs. Democracy*, above cited.

“As long as class society, founded on the most deep-rooted antagonism, continues to exist, repression remains a necessary means of breaking the will of the opposing side.”

If it were true that what has never happened in human history hitherto can never happen, we would not now have flying machines, radio, photography or even modern war.

This contention that you cannot alter the motive and purpose of the capitalist without using violence is equivalent to saying that you cannot overcome or remove greed or fear. Probably a direct attack upon greed or fear is ineffective, just as asceticism is a failure against desire. The only way to eliminate greed or fear is to get at the psychological and largely unconscious assumption or obsession that lies behind them, namely, that space-time separation is a complete and exclusive reality. That is to say, we must attack fear or greed by creating a subconscious sense of human unity and consequent security.

Non-violent resistance does create this sense of unity and security, as explained at some length in the chapters on psychology and philosophy. The capitalist's conviction of the complete reality of the separateness and disunity of mankind

is based upon his observation and experience of men and events. A powerful demonstration of non-violent resistance by the working class better disciplined and carried further than any yet, would be a new and very impressive part of his experience. And after being repeated a fairly small number of times, the evidence indicates that the capitalist's motives, assumptions, ideology and thinking will undergo radical alteration for the better.

If such a process takes place, there would be no violent counter-revolution by the capitalists, as there has been in all previous working class revolutions or attempts at revolution. It is a matter of history that there was very little violence in the actual process of taking over control by the workers in the Italian, Hungarian, French and Russian revolutions. The violence came about only with the subsequent counter-revolutions and the attempts to repel them. True non-violence upon one side will tend to create non-violence upon the other, and thus great and beneficial alterations may be effected without terrorism, violence or destruction. The hearts of the controlling class would be changed by non-violent resistance. They would not have

lost" power, but merely lost an error and would in the very process of change, have gained a power-with and power-for other people in exchange for their previous power-over them. The later stages, at least, of the change would be voluntary. Hence no desire for reversion. Hence true non-violent resistance cannot be stigmatized as "counter revolutionary."

One of the arguments of the Communists is in effect—Here is the tremendously impressive fact of the Russian Revolution. In that revolution violence was the method, violence succeeded; therefore, violence is the right method for every revolution to use.

But this is the fallacy of *post hoc propter hoc*. The mere fact that the revolution was successful and that violence was used does not prove that violence was the most important factor, in its success, even though we grant its dramatic quality. It is my belief that the chief reasons for the success of the Bolsheviki were their energy, courage, idealism, boldness, organizing ability, discipline, persistence, determination, devotion, self-sacrifice, intelligence, clearness of aim and plan, strength of conviction—all in the face of the weakness of the old

regime and the moral weakness of the Allied Governments. That is to say, it was the positive strength and discipline, built up through years of preparation, which won. Violence was a factor, but I believe it was more of a handicap than a help. These observations also apply to the creation of all existing States. The violence of the Bolsheviks, slight as it was at the beginning, enabled the Allies to arouse moral support for numerous counter-revolutionary expeditions against Russia. It is my belief that if the Bolsheviks had known and believed and been trained in the discipline of non-violent resistance, they would have won victories far more sweeping and lasting and beneficial than their actual accomplishment has been.

No one can deny that the Russian Revolution stirred and released vast hopes and forces of freedom all over the world, and that these forces are still at work. But on the other hand it aroused so much fear and hatred that it made possible some dreadful repression, reaction and tyranny which is also still flourishing in every country in the world. Even within Russia there is much restriction. Taking the world as a whole, if one reaches the conclusion that the new

freedom and hope exceed the new repression and tyranny, one wonders whether the cost was not greater than necessary. It is my belief that the instrument of non-violent resistance, skilfully wielded, would have brought far happier results with much smaller suffering and loss of life and in much shorter time.

It may appear rather presumptuous for an outsider to make suggestions such as these, but inasmuch as the Bolsheviks won much through the strength of their convictions, they should not begrudge strong convictions to others.

Not only is violence a very inefficient weapon of liberation but it is an exceedingly difficult weapon for the working class to get control of on any such scale as to be effective. Any fool can throw a bomb, but that is childishly futile. The difficulties which face an advocate of violent revolution in any modern state are clearly set forth in H. J. Laski's little book on *Communism*.¹

Although Trotsky is exceedingly keen and witty in exposing the inconsistencies and cloudy thinking of most of the politician-pacifists of Europe and America,

¹ I. Home University Library Series, Williams & Norgate, London, 1928.

he makes the mistake of most professional militarists in ascribing too much weight to violence itself and not enough to the indirect and wider psychological effects of violence.¹ Nor has he sufficiently examined the effect of non-violent resistance upon the morals of opponents, as set forth in Chapters VI and VII. This, I believe, greatly weakens, if it does not wholly invalidate, the argument in respect to violence in his book, *Where is Britain Going*. This oversight is in some respects strange because Trotsky himself made some brilliant experiments with enemy morale in his Brest-Litovsk negotiations. Although these negotiations were not non-violent in spirit, they were in outer method, and were very effective so far as they went. The German General, Von Hoffman, said of these negotiations, "It was Lenin and the Bolsheviks that broke our morale and gave us defeat and the revolution you now see ruining us."² Count Czernin, the representative for Austria at Brest-Litovsk, called the negotiations a "spiritual wrestling-match".³ So it seems

1. Cf. Col. Fuller's book on the *Reformation of War*, previously cited.

2. See Rhys-Williams—*Lenin*, p. 95; Scott & Selzer, New York, 1919.

3. See p. 553. vol. 2 of General Ludendorff's *My War Memories*, 2d ed. Hutchinson & Co., London.

curious, in a way, that the Communists, after making such clever use of at least the outward form of non-violent resistance, should be so bitterly opposed to its more complete use.

A somewhat similar blindness to the psychological effect of terrorism on all parties concerned is given in one of Lenin's speeches to young people in which he is reported to have said:—¹

“In our opinion, morality is entirely subordinate to the ininterests of the class war : everything is moral which is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for the uniting of the proletariat.”

We previously pointed out that the Communist theory of revolution is essentially that of a war to end war. Furthermore it appears from wider reading of communist literature that they not only take the view that the end justifies the means, but that in the class war the end—the supremacy of the working class—is the inevitable result of a historical process and so it adds a peculiar sanction to the violent means used. Such is the Marxian interpretation of history.

In our chapters on the psychology

1. p. 41 of *Lenin and Gandhi* by Rene Fulop-Miller, above cited.

and philosophy of non-violent resistance we have indicated why we believe that it is impossible to end violence by violence, and why a wrong means cannot be justified by an *a priori* good end. If our contentions be true, they indicate a flaw in the Communist logic.

The theory of terrorism as an aid to the workers is the same as the deterrence theory of criminal law. As Trotsky expresses it, "*Intimidation* is a powerful weapon of policy, both internationally and externally. War, like revolution, is founded upon intimidation." This is only a half-truth, and like most half-truths, it works up to a certain point and then fails. Violent punishment of criminals is not a deterrence to crime, nor is violence a means to gain freedom and a better life for the world. Violence may be somewhat efficient, just as Watt's first steam engine was efficient,¹ but non-violent resistance is more efficient, just as a modern steam turbine is more efficient.

Bernard Shaw has stated the matter vividly :—²

"The objection to military coercion is not that it is ineffective ; it is, on the contrary, terribly

1. See *limitation* in Chap. XV.

2. See pp. 295-6 of *Lenin and Gandhi*, above cited.

effective, but that its effects are incalculable. They are as often as not precisely the reverse of those contemplated ; and in all cases they go far beyond the intention of those who resort to it.....The moment violence begins men demand security at all costs ; and as security can never be obtained and the endless path to it lies through blood, violence means finally the extermination of the human race. That is why the conscience of mankind feels it to be wicked and finally destructive of everything it professes to conserve."

There is one powerful passage in Trotsky's *Dictatorship vs. Democracy The Defense of Terrorism*¹ which deserves consideration by itself. Talking of the meaning of the principle of the sacredness of human life in practice he says:—

"As long as human labor power, and consequently life itself, remain articles of sale and purchase, of exploitation and robbery, the principle of the 'sacredness of human life' remains a shameful lie, uttered with the object of keeping the oppressed slaves in their chains. . . . To make the individual sacred, we must destroy the social order which crucifies him. And this problem can only be solved by blood and iron."²

We can fully agree with him as to

1. At p. 63 of the American edition ; p. 60 of English edition.

2. Cf. Chap. VIII.

the necessity for a complete change in our social order, although we wholly disagree as to the method and means he proposes.

Non-violent resistance when fully understood and strongly and wisely used can and has conquered and ended political and economic exploitation within the limits aimed at. It is not an "opium of the people" nor a "chloroform for the conscience." It is a road to freedom, and far shorter, smoother and happier than the road of violence. Violence has been tried for thousands of years. Why not experiment with something new and scientific?

To quote Lenin himself, "Those who are engaged in the formidable task of overcoming capitalism must be prepared to try method after method until they find the one which answers the purpose best."¹

Class conflict is an undeniable fact but the error which lies behind it is not confined to the ruling class. It also is found among the workers. It can be eliminated only by an uncompromising and sincere search for truth, by thought and

1. Quoted in *Russia in the Shadows* by H. G. Wells, at p. 157 Geo. H. Doran, New York, 1921. Also in London.

action.¹ Non-violent resistance is the best mode of search for social truth. In our discussion of it we have tried not to conceal, deny or gloss over the hard problems and cruel situations and difficult choices that have to be made in the practical life of the world and the winning of freedom.

Communism is a great and vital belief and endeavor. In all great systems of belief, whether political, religious, social, economic or otherwise, there is a mixture of truth and error. My belief compels me to discriminate between what seems right and what seems a mistake in the Communist endeavor. As this is not a book on general social or political theory, I cannot discuss its other aspects besides the element of violence. But as I do not want to record merely adverse criticism, let me say that although I disapprove of violence and terror, I do approve of what Keynes has called the "ethical essence" of Communism, namely, an attempt "to construct a framework of society in which pecuniary motives as influencing action shall have a changed relative importance, in which social approbations shall be differently distributed."

1. Cf. W. E. Hocking, *Man and the State*, Chap. 29, Yale University Press, New Haven, U. S. A., 1926.

Let us now discuss Nietzsche's ideas and attitude toward war and violence. He is an important figure in European thought and has had very great influence. And as war is so closely woven into the texture of modern Western life, we must understand Nietzsche clearly in this matter.

His position and limitations are described by Spengler as follows:—¹

"Consider the historical horizon of Nietzsche: His conceptions of decadence, militarism, the transvaluation of all values, the will to power, lie deep in the essence of Western civilization and are for the analysis of that civilization of decisive importance. But what, do we find, was the foundation upon which he built up his creation? Romans and Greeks, Renaissance and European present, with a fleeting and uncomprehending side-glance at Indian philosophy—in short 'ancient, mediæval and modern' history. Strictly speaking, he never once moved outside the scheme, nor did any other thinker of his time."

Nietzsche is generally considered a strong and brilliant advocate of war, of ruthlessness, and of the doctrine that might makes right. His English interpreter, A. Wolf, believes, however, that is a mistake and that his writings were appropriated by the militarists and

1. O. Spengler—*Decline of the West*, Vol. I., p. 24.

jingoes under a misapprehension. Wolf says of Nietzsche.¹

“ His weakness for epigram and paradox too often betrayed him into utterance the playful extravagance of which was rather obscured by the unsystematic form of his writing. It was, therefore, perfectly easy to dress up the chauvinists' poverty of thought in the brilliant raiment of Nietzsche's picturesque language. ”

Wolf also points out that part of Nietzsche's reputation on this point arose out of the fact that the noted German war-jingo, Bernhardi, adopted as the motto for his book on war one of Nietzsche's dicta from Zarathustra. But on reading the whole of the passage in question, it is clear that Nietzsche was talking about a war of ideas, not of physical violence.

There is not room in this book for a detailed discussion of Nietzsche's ideas on this topic, but the interested reader will be able to investigate the matter for himself on the basis of what few suggestions we can make.

It seems probable that some of Nietzsche's ideas about power, struggle and violence were based on a misunder-

1. A. Wolf—*The Philosophy of Nietzsche*—Constable London, 1915, p. 17.

standing of the ideas of Darwin and Weissmann. The correction of this in the light of more recent scientific thought has been given us by A. M. Carr-Saunders, F. H. Giddings and others.¹

We find a curious inconsistency in Nietzsche in regard to his attitude toward non-violent resistance. When discussing Christ and Christianity, in *The Genealogy of Morals*, he berates non-violent resistance as "slave morality" a "clever revenge," a manifestation of resentment, a "decadence valuation," a weakness. Yet in *Ecce Homo* (p. 21) in condemning resentment as a very weakening emotion, he says :

"This was fully grasped by that profound physiologist Buddha. His 'religion,' which it would be better to call a system of hygiene, in order to avoid confounding it with a creed so wretched as Christianity, depended for its effect upon the triumph over resentment : to make the soul free therefrom was considered the first step toward recovery. 'Not through hostility is hostility put to flight ; through friendship does hostility end' : this stands at the beginning of Buddha's teaching—this is not a precept of morality but of physiology. "

¹ See *Biology and War* by A. M. Carr-Saunders, Foreign Affairs, New York, April, 1929, p. 427 ; Also *Democracy and Empire*, by F. H. Giddings, Macmillan, New York, 1900, Chap. 22 ;

We agree with Nietzsche in his estimate of the value of non-resentment, but it is amusing that his prejudice against Christianity blinds him from seeing that Christ's position in this respect was as sound as Buddha's. I think he misapprehended Christ's views about compassion and then, in that confusion, condemned more of his other ideas than the logic of the position required.

When we examine his writings carefully we find that he strongly praises conflict, struggle, energy, courage, sincerity, and truthfulness. The wars he advocates are wars of ideas, although he also believes that when nations become decadent, a war of violence is the only thing that can purge them. Yet he believes that revenge and resentment are very bad mistakes. He said that war betrays people into exaggerated self-esteem, and results in making the victors stupid and the vanquished revengeful. He draws vivid pictures of the iniquities and stupidities of military life. In *The Wanderer* (Sections 279, 284), he looks forward to a "great day" of disarmament, saying :

"To disarm *whilst most capable of arms*, from an elevation of sentiment—that is the way to real peace, which must always rest upon a disposition for peace; while the so-called armed peace,

such as we find in all lands now, rests on warlikeness of disposition, which trusts neither itself nor its neighbor, and half from hate, half from fear, refuses to lay its weapons down. Better perish than hate and fear, and *twice better perish than make oneself hated and feared*—this must "some day be the supreme maxim of every individual political society."

Two of the most careful and devoted students of Nietzsche, A. Wolf and W. M. Salter, assure us that despite minor contradictions and ambiguities, Nietzsche is opposed to war. They have examined all his writings in great detail and substantiate their conclusions by elaborate references and quotations.¹

It would seem that in many of the passages where Nietzsche apparently advocates war he is really telling men that they must be true to themselves above all things, and that if they do not have enough courage and largeness of vision to give up violence, then they should wield the weapons in which they do have faith, thus being as courageous as they can be. Evil as war is, it is not as evil as the hypocrisy, untruth, resentment, and cowardice of some kinds of

1. See A. Wolf—*The Philosophy of Nietzsche*—Constable, London, 1915; W. M. Salter—*Nietzsche, the Thinker*—Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1917; *Ibid*—*Nietzsche and the War*—International Journal of Ethics, April, 1917.

so called peace. In such an aspect war might be considered the better of the two evils. An instance of this is a passage in Zarathustra (I, 10).

"I know the hatred and envy of your hearts. Ye are not great enough not to know of hatred and envy. Then be great enough not to be ashamed of them! And if ye cannot be saints of knowledge, then, I pray you, be at least its warriors. They are the companions and forerunners of such saintship."

Yet Nietzsche's idea about "the superman" and aristocracy were undoubtedly dependent on violence, in spirit at least. J. N. Figgis and A. K. Rogers expose the fallacies in Nietzsche's ideas about aristocracy,¹ and W. E. Hocking explains very interestingly² the superiority of "power for one's neighbors" over Nietzsche's conception of "power *over* them," and "power through ideas" as an advanced form of the "will to power" which Nietzsche advocated. Non-violent resistance would seem to be an instrument for gaining power for or

1. J. N. Figgis—*Will to Freedom*—Scribners, New York, 1917; *Nietzsche and the Aristocratic Ideal*—by A. K. Rogers, 30 *International Journal of Ethics* 450, October, 1919.

2. W. E. Hocking—*Man and the State*—Yale University Press, New Haven, U. S. A., 1926, at pp. 314 ff. See also M. P. Follett—*Creative Experience*—Longmans Green, New York, 1924, pp. 181 to 191.

with people, and to express power through ideas.

Nietzsche may not have expressed a clear, unified philosophy of war or of peace, but he cannot fairly be cited as an authority for war. Indeed, some of his passages on the value of courage and hardiness and the necessity for suffering in "Thus spake Zarathustra" and other works, would be excellent reading for the non-violent resister.

SOME APPARENTLY AMBIGUOUS
AUTHORITIES

OF the various great religious prophets and seers, Buddha's position appears to be clear and unequivocal in favor of peace, gentleness, and non-violence toward all living creatures. This is also true of the long line of Jain teachers. Lao Tsu appears also to have been quite consistently a pacifist with only a slight hesitation about certain problems of State. He does not seem to have had many followers outside his own land, perhaps because his philosophy was, as generally understood, very quietistic and dealt very slightly with the problem of human suffering. With regard to both of these dim figures of antiquity, Buddha and Lao Tsu, we have not even today recovered sufficient records to be able to place them in the full light of scientific historical research.

Of Mohammed and the *Bhagavad*

Gita, I speak with great hesitation, for I have but the slenderest qualifications to venture any comment. I have but little to say. Yet I may be able to help remove some misapprehension.

In the West, most people think of Islam as a very militant religion, but they conveniently forget the record of Christianity in this respect. Of the two, Christianity has a record of more violence and bloodshed than Islam.

In the Koran, there seem to be passages inconsistent with each other, at least apparently to one who is not a scholar of Islam. Some passages seem to praise wrath, vengeance and violence, while others favor gentleness, forgiveness and loving kindness. Yet it would seem that originally, at least, and in its preponderant emphasis, Islam probably stood for peace and non-violence. Even in regard to the passages which seemingly support anger, revenge and violence, we should remember that all these three modes of feeling and action have at least the virtue of energy, and often the further virtue of sincerity and consistency between the heart and hand.¹

1. Cf. also C. F. Andrews—*The Body of Humanity*, Visva-Bharati Quarterly, April, 1925.

The very name Islam signifies peace. A Muslim, according to the Koran, is he who has made his peace with God and man, with the creator as well as His creatures. The daily greeting between Muslims is 'peace' as enjoined in the Koran. In the Koran, there is much emphasis on the unity of God and the spiritual equality of all men.

Inasmuch as most Westerners know so little of the beauties in Islam, it will perhaps not be amiss to quote a few of the passages favoring forgiveness and kindness, so that those who are interested in our general subject may realize the depth of insight of the Muslim Prophet.

The introductory formula recurring at the opening of each chapter of the Koran is :—

“In the name of God, the most compassionate, the merciful.”

The Koran states the special mission of the prophet of Islam thus:—“We have not sent thee otherwise, O Mohammed, than as a mercy unto all creatures.” (XXI, S. 108).

Muslims are commanded to practise

and preach forbearance or patience. (Sabr.) On this point the Koran says :

“O true believers, forbear and preach forbearance unto each other.” (III, S. 20).

“O ye who believe, seek help with forbearance and prayer, for God is with those who forbear. (II, S. 19.)

“God loves those who forbear.” (III, S. 15).

The distinctive mark, according to the Koran, of good and right-minded people is that “they practise forbearance, in times of distress, trouble and fear.” (II, S. 22).

“Verily those who forbear shall receive their recompense without measure.” (XXXIX, S. 2).

“O believers, if you forbear in the face of all provocations and be not aggressive, their (the enemies’) tactics cannot injure you in the least.” (III, S. 12).

“O believers, you will surely have to hear much of evil speechyet if you forbear and remain clean, that would be an act of very great courage.” (XXXI, S. 2.)

“Forbear what the enemies say.” (XXXVIII, S. 2.)

“Bear patiently the calumnies against thee and leave them alone in a decent way.” (LXXIII, S. 2).¹

1. The foregoing citations are from an excellent article by Mr. Abdul Majid, B.A., M.R.A.S., on *Islam and Satyagraha* in Modern Review (Calcutta) for October,

"It is good to overcome evil with good, and it is evil to resist evil with evil." ¹

In the Koran we find such statements as these:

"If a man strike thee, and in striking drop his staff, pick it up and hand it to him again."

"Let there be no violence in religion."

"A fair speech, and to forgive, is better than alms followed by mischief."

"Whoever is without mildness is without goodness."

"There is no accomplishment like an amiable disposition."

"Shall I not inform you of a better act than fasting, alms and prayers? Making peace between one another; enmity and malice tear up rewards by the roots."

"For him that hath gone to the relief of the oppressed, Allah hath seventy-three pardons." "Assist any person oppressed, whether muslim or Non-Muslim."

In the *Speeches and Table Talk of the Prophet Mohammed*, selected and

1920. He cites and comments on many other passages of like import. See also Appendix D of *Spiritual Swadeshi* by G. H. Rao, M.A., The Swarajya Press, Madras, India, 1923.

1. See *Non-Resistance and its Antithesis* by H. Lang, 37 Int. J. of Ethics, 58 London, Oct., 1926.

translated by Stanley Lane-Poole¹ we find such fine passages as these: "He is not strong or powerful who throws people down, but he is strong who withholds himself from anger."

"Say not, if people do good to us, we will do good to them, and if people oppress us, we will oppress them; but resolve that if people do good to you, you will do good to them, and if you oppress them, oppress them not again."

There are also some beautiful passages about charity.

Tradition tells us that the Prophet never struck anyone in his life, and that he was very fond of children.¹

As to the *Bhagavad Gita*, there are many who feel that the injunction in that poem is clearly to fight, or at least for soldiers to fight, and hence, that the *Gita* supports war. While I am no pandit or even a reader of Sanskrit, it seems clear to me that the *Gita* enjoins fighting or killing only upon those who have no anger, no fear, no passion, no attachment.³

1. Golden Treasury Series, Macmillan, London, 1915

2. See also articles by V. G. Desai on *Ahimsa in Islam* in *Young India* for Sept. 1 and Sept. 8, 1927.

3. Cf. *Bhagavad Gita* II, 56, 57, 62, 63; XVIII 23 to 28, 53, 67. See also the description of the steadfast man 28 Chap. II; of the wise man in Chap. XIII; of the godly

Those who take the *Gita* as their guide and who are inclined to warfare and violence nowadays would be wise to be sure, before they enlist or begin to fight, that they have and will have no anger, ambition, fear or attachment to the fruit of their action. Anger and hatred are forms of attachment. Such consideration, if honest, would, if my interpretation is correct, immediately remove from the army and from prospective recruits a very large number. Also, it is a most remarkable, even unique, man who can nowadays engage in modern battle without fear or anger.

For these reasons the injunctions in the *Gita* in respect to fighting, do not apply, it seems to me, to ordinary mortals in these modern days of war and civil violence.

It should further be remembered that many of the interpreters of the *Gita* take the whole poem as an allegory of the Soul, and thereby construe the fighting passages as meaning spiritual conflict. This is Mr. Gandhi's interpretation.

Let us next consider Jesus Christ.
*The record of his teachings contains

man in Chap. XV : of the surmounter of the qualities in Chap. XIV ; and of those whom God loves in Chap. XII of the *Gita*.

apparent inconsistencies, and the words and deeds of his professed followers, in relation to violence and peace, have been highly inconsistent.¹ Christ, therefore, presents the inquirer with a difficult problem.

Those who seek to learn from the record what was Christ's teaching on this point will have to bear in mind certain principles of interpretation. First, there is the rule adopted by courts of law, that in interpreting any particular part of a document, full consideration must be given to the entire document, the manner and purpose of its writing, and other relevant circumstances. So, in this instance, the entire four Gospels must be considered as a whole, with all the results of modern criticism and scholarship. All Christ's acts as well as his words must be considered as a whole in their relation to this one question. The interpreter should, among other things, think over and compare all that Christ did and said relative to fear, anger, courage, love, criticism, resistance, forgiveness, humility, meekness, pride, envy, wealth, money valuations, neighbors, brothers, soldiers, government, war, violence, hate, inner

1. See Kirby Page—*Jesus or Christianity*—Doubleday, Doran, New York, 1929.

motives and guide, qualifications to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, etc.

Saint Paul laid down another rule of interpretation which is, in a sense, a corollary of the first. It is used by all scholars and translators of literature of all sorts, namely, that "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." We cannot gain the truth by mere chopping of texts.

Several other principles of interpretation were left by Christ himself. "Who-soever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." (Mark 10: 15); Luke 18: 17). By substituting the phrase *spiritual unity* for *Kingdom of God*, this verse indicates that for an understanding of Christ's teaching, one of whose central points is the Kingdom of God, one must become as simple, direct and humble as a little child. Some may say that spiritual unity and the Kingdom of God are not synonymous, but the former is certainly an important element in the latter. Compare also in this connection, "Except ye turn and become as little children, ye, shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." (Matt. 18: 4) and the verses about the inner meaning of his message being hidden from the wise and revealed unto babes (Matt. 11: 25; Luke 10: 21).

Lastly, there is the pragmatic test contained in the verse, "By their fruits, ye shall know them." (Matt. 7: 16).

Some say that Christ's words were highly figurative, only Oriental hyperbole, and not meant to be taken literally. There probably is some metaphorical language in his sayings, yet he certainly meant them to be taken in earnest, else how can we explain such sayings as "And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6: 46); "For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you" (John 13: 15); "Ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you" (John 15: 14). The close similarity between his conduct and his words in regard to non-violent resistance rules out most attempts at hyperbolical construction of these passages.

Again, some say that there are many passages in the Sermon on the Mount which are obviously impossible in these modern days and must be taken metaphorically. For instance, it enjoins to give to all who ask, to lend without any expectation of return; it forbids the laying up of treasure; it condemns both judge and litigant in courts of law. If such things as these are so manifestly

impractical and inexpedient, why is not non-violent resistance in the same class?

The reply to this objection is found partly in our chapter on Economic Aspects and partly in the chapter on Philosophical Implications. If mankind will only seriously try, there will be enough property to enable us to give to all who ask. Money interest would be absurd under such a state of affairs. Those who have courage enough to undertake the policy now, have in some cases reported a remarkable degree of success. There are some economic laws which we do not know yet. Treasure need not be laid up, for true wealth consists in a flow of consumable goods and it cannot be locked up and continue to be real treasure. Money securities are not essential to a sound organization of society. The progress of informal arbitration is one indication of the changing value of court litigation. In short, the Sermon on the Mount is far more immediately practical than most people realize, and the more it is attempted, the more successful will it prove.

Those who incline to interpret the net weight of Christ's sayings and acts in favor of violence and war ought to remember that Nietzsche, who is perhaps

the keenest and most searching opponent of Christianity and of most of Christ's ideas, interprets the record as being in support of non-violent resistance.

Following the foregoing rules of interpretation and the various other considerations set forth in this book, I interpret the record as showing very definitely that Jesus Christ advocated and practised non-violent resistance. For those who wish to work out their own interpretation, I append in a footnote a list of some of the best discussions I have found, some in favor of violence, some in favor of non-violence.¹

1. C. J. Cadoux—*The Early Christian Attitude to War*—Headley Bros., London, 1919; A. T. Cadoux—*Jesus and Civil Government*—Allen & Unwin, London, 1923; J. W. Graham—*War from a Quaker Point of View*—Headley, 1915. London; H. Waylen—*Mountain Pathways*—Kegan Paul, London, 1912; W. E. Wilson—*Christ and War*—Headley Bros., London; Leo Tolstoi—*What I Believe, The Kingdom of God is Within You*;—V. G. Shimkhovitch—*Toward the Understanding of Jesus*—Macmillan, New York, 1925; A. Ballou—*Christian Non-Resistance*—Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia, 1910; W. Walsh—*Jesus; War or Peace*—Free Religious Movement, London; L. Richards—*The Christian's Alternative to War*—Macmillan, New York, 1929, also London; J. H. Holmes—*New Wars for Old*—Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, 1918; J. M. Fry—*Christ and Peace*—Headley, London, 1916; A. G. Hogg—*Christianity and Force*—Papers for War Time 15, Oxford University Press, London, 1915; B. H. Streeter—*War, This War and the Sermon on the Mount*—Ibid 20; W. E. Hocking, *Human Nature and its Remaking*—Chaps. 24, 40, 41; Lord Shaw—*The Trial of Jesus*—George Newnes, Ltd.

Official Christianity and the churches have for the most part, especially in great crises, been supporters of war, and have interpreted Christ's life and sayings as favoring war as regretable but necessary. I believe this has been so partly because of the close affiliation of the Church with the State, partly because most people who claim to be christians have mixed a "reasonable" amount of selfishness and mammon with their worship of God, and partly because for one reason or another they have never squarely faced the problem and sincerely thought it through, and partly for other reasons too complex to state here. Hence, many have interpreted Christ as being rather metaphorical, or impractical at certain points, or that his ideas were addressed only to the particular place, time and circumstances in which he lived. But almost up to the time when the Church made a formal alliance with

London; 1929; Nietzsche's works, especially *The Genealogy of Morals* and *Anti-Christ*. B. W. Bacon—Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A.; H. Schumacker—*Resistance in the Light of the Gospel*—103 *Catholic World* 513, July 1916, New York; L. Walt—*Nietzsche, Tolstoi and the Sermon on the Mount*—111 *Catholic World* 577, Aug. 1920; *The Warlike Context of the Gospels*—By C. Hargrave, 14 *Hibbert Journal* 366; Book Review by F.J.C. Hearnshaw of J. W. Graham's *War from a Quaker Point of View*, 14 *Hibbert Journal* 653; *A Quaker Apologia*—By J. W. Graham, 14 *Hibbert J.* 123.

the State, a different interpretation prevailed. The State at all times and places has believed in and used violence,¹ and it did not allow the Church to alter it fundamentally in this respect. In making the alliance, the Church altered its position on this point more than the State did. The problem is indeed exceedingly complicated and difficult. Sincere minds have struggled with it for ages. It is not surprising that there are many differences of opinion.

Lack of scholarly qualifications and of space forbid my entering into any prolonged discussion of the various possible interpretations of the different ambiguous passages in the Gospels. The interested reader will find them in the books above referred to. I will only attempt to add an interpretation of one difficult passage, an interpretation which is different from any that I have seen so far, and which therefore may be useful. It is in regard to the passage in Luke 22: 35-38,—whose crucial words are, "But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none, let him sell his cloak, and buy a sword."

I. Cf. F. Oppenheimer—*The State*—London and New York.

Christ said these words at the last supper. The disciples had just been demonstrating their failure to understand his message. They had been disputing their precedence in the new kingdom which they thought was about to be established. Peter's weakness was apparent to Christ. Judas had just revealed his treacherous intentions.

As a last attempt to rally their wavering faith Christ asked them "When I sent you forth (previously) without purse, and wallet, and shoes, lacked ye anything?" And they said, "Nothing," but their attitude probably added, "But now it is different."

It was fairly clear that they would all desert him in the coming crisis. For the time being they had neither the understanding nor the courage required; although it is clear from his instructions that Christ expected them to rally again to his cause, after his death and after the illumination of the Holy Spirit should come to them.

He had often spoken against hypocrisy. His whole treatment of sinners shows how he valued sincerity. Sinners who were true to themselves, he said, would enter the Kingdom of Heaven ahead of proud or hypocritical people.

His desire for consistency between inner attitude and outward conduct is shown in all his teaching.

Now, while the disciples were lacking in courage, understanding and faith, and between the time of his going from them until they should come to understand and act on his message, would it not be better to let their outward action be sincere and consistent with the confused and wavering state of their minds and hearts? He himself would not be there to guide and encourage them. Therefore, let them buy swords, for they had ceased for the time being to rely on him and the power of his truth. If they are not brave enough to use soul-force, let them be as brave as they can, and be honest anyhow, so let them procure swords for the interim.

Then when they promptly produced two swords, he said, "It is enough," meaning, perhaps, "I thought so," in regard to their state of mind and heart; also by way of restraint, so that they would not, in a panic, arm themselves to the teeth.

To state it from a slightly different angle, the passage might have substantiated the same meaning as George Fox's

reply to the inquiry of the newly converted William Penn as to how long he should retain his sword:—"Wear it as long as thou canst." That is to say, the disciples had better rely on the sword until their growing understanding and convictions should make them realize their mistake and cause them to cast it away.

Yet Christ did not give up trying to teach them about non-violence, for as soon as Peter cut off the servant's ear, Christ rebuked Peter and warned all present that "all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Then as an example of the better way he apologized to the servant and healed the wound. So long as Christ was present among them, he would not permit violence by his followers.

While we are discussing the inconsistencies or apparent inconsistencies of great pacifists we ought to mention the case of Mr. Gandhi. He has done more to advance the cause of non-violent resistance by his example, his keenness of vision and thought, and his organizing and training ability than any other man in the modern world. And yet there are several apparent inconsistencies in his action and writings. These greatly

distress his followers and correspondingly hearten his opponents.

The seeming inconsistencies in his actions are three:—he helped in the Boer war by organizing and leading an ambulance corps; he did this again in the Zulu "rebellion" in Natal in 1906; and during the Great War he actively engaged in recruiting work in India for the British Empire. In respect to his writings many pacifists were shocked by his editorial in his paper, *Young India*, for September 13, 1928, in which, referring to a future independent Indian Government, he wrote :—

"If there was a national Government, whilst I should not take any direct part in any war, I can conceive occasions when it would be my duty to vote for the military training of those who wish to take it. For I know that all its members do not believe in non-violence to the extent I do. It is not impossible to make a person or a society non-violent by compulsion."

He said substantially the same to some students at Wardha.¹

These acts and words have aroused much criticism and discussion. He has given ample space to it in the columns of

1. Reported in *Young India* for Jan. 10, 1929.

Young India and elsewhere.¹ It seems clear from Mr. Gandhi's discussion of the reasons for his conduct on these occasions that he acted partly upon intuition as well as reason. The reasoned explanation that he gives is, if I understand it correctly, somewhat as follows:—

That at that time he believed that the total effect of the British Empire, despite grave faults and evils, was good, and that it was his duty therefore to support it in its hours of difficulty, although he would not cease to struggle against its evils. By thus trying to render good in return for evil, he hoped that the British Government would be softened and would relieve some of the grosser hardships of the Indian people. Furthermore that "underlying *ahimsa* (gentleness) is the unity of all life; the error of one cannot but affect all; and hence man cannot be wholly free from *himsa* (violence);" that the conditions of life on this earth are necessarily limited and

1. See the issues of *Young India* (published at Ahmedabad, (India) for 1928, Feb. 9, 16, 23, Mar. 1, 8, 15, Sept. 13, 1929; Jan. 3, 10; Feb. 7; also M. K. Gandhi—*My Experiments with Truth*, Vol. II, Part IV, Chap. 38, 40, Part V, Ch. 27—Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, India; M. K. Gandhi—*Satyagraha in South Africa*—Chap. IX and XI—Ganesan, Madras, India; Biography of M. K. Gandhi, by J. J. Doke, Natesan, Madras, India; *Young India* 1919-22, pp. 259, 658, previously cited.

defective; that our whole life here is a compromise between the claims of spirit and matter; that we must therefore decide what compromises we can afford to make; that complete non-violence is an ideal and cannot be completely realized toward every living creature; that it would be folly wholly to sever one's connection with the society to which one belongs; that many people firmly believe in violence and that it is contrary to the spirit of non-violence to try to compel them to adopt non-violence, but it must be left to the operation of persuasion by love and example; that during the Great War he had "no status to resist participation and could not avoid participation at least indirectly;" that now he feels that he has the strength to resist war in his own prison. That if he becomes a citizen under a completely Indian-controlled government he will have to allow other citizens who differ with him their due share in the government and even help provide the means for their education through a process which might be necessary to a given type of mind and character even though that might seem to encourage violence.

He admits that those acts were inconsistent with the strict principles or

theory of *ahimsa* (kindness, gentleness and love toward every creature) but states that his motive was, and always, is the furtherance of peace and *ahimsa*.

But this explanation does not satisfy many of his supporters. Some accept it in all sincerity but simply cannot understand it. Others, more doubtful, feel that it is self-deception. Others who do not realize his self-knowledge and sincerity call it a quibble, or imply that his patriotism carried him away.

But all who know Mr. Gandhi personally, know his profound humility, self-knowledge, readiness to acknowledge publicly any mistakes he has made, and his deep sincerity and love of truth. These facts and the intuitive basis of certain of his actions, make it almost certain that there is some element in the situation which has not yet reached intellectual formulation even by Mr. Gandhi himself. After much thought I have come to the following conclusion.

In regard to Mr. Gandhi's work in war time, it seems that he was sincerely trying to render good for evil. This is a valid principle of non-violent resistance. He now recognizes that these activities were not good; and if another war should come he would refuse to parti-

cipate on behalf of the British Government in either recruiting or ambulance work.¹ It is my understanding that he now believes that doing ambulance is directly in support of war, and he would not engage in it for any government. The war opened his eyes to many things previously not seen so clearly, just as it did for all of us. He may have made a mistake, but he was not consciously intending to forward the cause of war.

Most of the Western pacifists who refused all war service whatsoever were not, I believe, feeling the same burden of grievances against their governments that Mr. Gandhi was. At the time of the Boer war and Zulu war, all Indians in South Africa and Natal were being severely persecuted and discriminated against by those governments, and Mr. Gandhi was engaged in an arduous struggle of non-violent resistance against the government, which the Indians subsequently won. But they chivalrously ceased their struggle to help their opponents in difficulty, just as they did at the time of the railway strike in South Africa. That was trying to render good for evil. It seems like a more positive attempt to conquer the evil that was partly responsible for

1. See *Young India* for Mar. 8, 1928.

those wars, than was the simple refusal of all service on the part of the Western pacifists. Therefore, it seems to me that the West, at least, has no grounds for criticising Mr. Gandhi for inconsistency on these occasions.

In regard to his statement that he might some day vote in favor of military training in India for those who desired it the explanation lies, I believe, in the principle of being true to oneself and urging and helping all men to be true to themselves. It is one aspect of Mr. Gandhi's own principle of Satyagraha, "holding fast to truth." It is the same principle that explains some apparent inconsistencies in the cases of Christ and Nietzsche. Mr. Gandhi may not have phrased it clearly, but I think that is what was at the back of his mind.

There are many Indians who sincerely believe in violence. They are a part of the commonwealth to which he belongs. They will have a right to their proportionate weight in determining the policy of the country. It would be contrary to the spirit of non-violence, autocratically to compel them to stifle their convictions, if they outnumber Mr. Gandhi's followers. Non-violent resistance must win its way by example and love, not by coercion.

Men with a sincere belief in violence must perhaps bang their heads against the hard wall of experience before they can learn a more efficient way. Is it not the part of wisdom and fairness and love to let them learn in accordance with the necessities of their nature, nay, even to help them so to learn, hard as the experience will be for them and the whole country? It would be like the wise parent who lets his son, just coming to maturity, waste some money in the process of learning how to control his finances.

Perhaps another element of explanation lies in the importance of courage. No one can be a successful non-violent resister who does not have courage. Indeed, Mr. Gandhi has said that courage and Satyagraha (non-violent resistance) are almost synonymous. Courage, being a mode of recognition of spiritual reality and eternity, is allied to spiritual unity. Many people have slight courage and need to develop it. Also many of them may be the sort who must first learn courage through violence before they can realize the higher courage of non-violent resistance.

Voting for military training might, under certain circumstances, be done in such a way as not to encourage or com-

promise with war. To maintain consistency between one's actual inner state of mind and heart, one's real attitude, and one's outer actions is more important than any outward restraint from violence. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Those who sincerely believe in war should be allowed to act consistently with their beliefs, meanwhile pressing upon their attention the idea, examples and results of a better way.

It is to be noted that Mr. Gandhi relies much on the *Bhagavad Gita* for spiritual guidance. That poem lays much stress upon sincerity and truth to one's inner attitude and nature, at the same time urging that it should be constantly purified, controlled and enlightened.

Furthermore, let it be remembered that Mr. Gandhi did not definitely say that he would surely vote for military training. He merely spoke of it as a possibility under certain conceivable circumstances.

But after having read in our chapter on philosophy that an apparently good end does not justify an evil means, the critic may feel that Mr. Gandhi was trying to justify possible military training (an evil means) by the principle of sincerity among all men (a good end). Yet he

was not attempting to justify military training, but his permission and even support for others to have military training if they insisted on it, under certain circumstances. That is, he was justifying tolerance plus non-violent persuasion (a good means) by the principle of sincerity (a good end). To such of his critics on this point as may be Christians, perhaps the parable of the wheat and tares would be a not wholly inapt illustration of the situation.

Nor does Trotsky's criticism of a certain type of pacifist, cited in Chapter XII, apply to this situation. Gandhi did not say that "of course if war should come, I will support the Government." On the contrary, he very explicitly and frequently has said and continues to say that he would not take part in war and would continue to try to persuade others to do likewise. A parent may continue to advise his son to spend money wisely, although at the same time he gives money to the boy with freedom to spend it as he chooses. The father has faith that even though and perhaps because the boy may make mistakes and waste some money, he will probably eventually learn wisdom.

For most people, perhaps, mistakes

and the freedom to make mistakes, are a necessary part of learning.

It may be pointed out that the mere form of an act is not the complete indication of the inner motive. For instance, refraining from violence may be either the act of a coward or of a courageous non-violent resister. Serving in an ambulance corps might be done out of pure compassion or to render good for evil, or in order to maintain the army at its highest efficiency and defeat the enemy whom one hates. It is the inner attitude which is most important. The outer action is important as a symbol or expression of the inner motives. No matter what is the appearance of affairs, we cannot fairly say that another person is inconsistent, because we do not know his heart. We must not be literalists. Those whose personally know Mr. Gandhi do not doubt the purity of his heart.

XVIII

THE DEVELOPMENT AND ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

MANY of the peace movements dwell at great length on the evils of war and the consequent necessity for peace, but except for suggestions for perfecting the League of Nations, the World Court, and what is known as "international understanding" there seem to be relatively few ideas as to how to create and insure peace, or as to what are the particular requisites and purposes of peace. Furthermore, the proposals seem always something to be done by some one else than the reader—they are something that "ought" to be done by Governments, by statesmen, by educators, by great bankers, or the like. This produces a feeling in the average reader partly of frustration, partly of irresponsibility, and partly of irritation at the great leaders for not doing their job of saving humanity.

Herein lies one of the great merits of non-violent resistance. With it, every single individual of every race, nation, occupation, and of all ages above infancy, can do something real and immediate and continuous for the cause of peace, without waiting for any other person or organization to do something first. It suddenly becomes clear that the job of saving humanity does not rest with the great leaders but begins and continues with each one of us. The range of influence of a few entirely sincere, courageous acts or words is beyond knowing. Every person is a creator, and as such, has both power and responsibility in the making of a better world. The conduct and words of every one count, and may influence unknown persons at the end of the world as well as friends and neighbors.

The acts, words, thoughts and attempts to create a finer inner attitude on the part of each individual are a kind of drill, training and discipline in preparation for mass or corporate action on a large scale. By undergoing the drill each person is serving his country far more effectively than by enlisting in the army or navy. We have said that the evils of our community and national and international life are but the external result

and reflection of our inner psychological and spiritual defects. The real evil and enemy is within each one of us. In that inner field of battle we may have unnumbered defeats, but nevertheless there we have more freedom to create and act than anywhere in the outside world. That is the place where any real peace movement must begin. Nobody gets any Nobel peace prizes there, but if they win they gain a creative power and inner wealth that creates its own prizes and wealth of vastly greater value. In that field each person is his own trainer and drill sergeant.

Despite all the war clouds and war mongers there is an infinite fund of kindness, generosity and goodwill in people of all kinds everywhere, in every nation, needing merely to be implemented and provided with a means of action in order to begin now to create a new and finer world. If people can only devise suitable instruments for goodwill, the world can move forward with amazing rapidity. The energy is there, waiting for an engine.

In my opinion, non-violent resistance is the long-desired implement. In this last chapter we will, make a few suggestions of practical detail as to how we can

put it to work in the various situations and relationships of life.

Part of the work can be done by individuals, with themselves and in personal relationships, another part by groups and organizations of every size, whether social, educational, economic, political or otherwise. We will consider these two parts separately.

As there is much to be said, the limits of space compel us to be brief and condensed. But we trust that the previous chapters will have made the principles clear enough so that the reader can proceed to amplify these suggestions without difficulty. Although the necessity for brevity may make the statements sound very definite, none of them are intended to be dogmatic or final. They are all suggestions, merely to be considered or experimented with in the search for something permanently reliable. For it must be remembered that in our organization of peace we are in a very crude and elementary stage, just as mankind was ages ago when military organization first began to be worked out and used. The future is full of enormously interesting problems in the development of peace.

The individual and personal and

small group aspects of our problem are somewhat like the development of army field service regulations, not so rigid, of course, but nevertheless a definite problem in organization for action and will. Some suggestions of this nature are as follows:

In order to develop the ability to meet difficult situations without fear or anger, in the manner of true non-violent resistance, it is helpful often to imagine many such situations in advance and think out the best way to act. Imagine not only important or greatly violent situations but the more frequent little occasions of annoyance, irritation, anxiety, dread, etc. Thus one may rehearse in advance a plan of non-violence, develop a pattern of action, provide against one's weakness, and make one's eventual action much easier and surer. Or, if thoughts come to us which stir resentment, anger, scorn, jealousy, fear or other divisive feelings, try to plan a course of conduct which will mean overcoming the unpleasant force by creative goodwill. Perhaps better still, whenever one feels stirring within, some resentment or anger of any degree, stop and try to see what it is that one is fearing to lose, for some such fear is always at the bottom

of such feelings, as we learned in Chapter II. Then one can decide whether that possible loss is really so important, or whether it could not be prevented or salvaged by creative goodwill; or even try to realize the fact that it is impossible to lose any spiritual reality. Such considerations usually cause the anger or fear to disappear, or at least greatly to diminish.

If the provoking situation is caused by the selfishness or inconsiderateness or cheating or deceit of some other person, it may be helpful to reflect that although these may cause us very considerable loss of time or money or something else very valuable, we must not let them cause us the greatest possible loss of all, namely, our sense of spiritual unity with all, our awareness of the divine principle in everyone and every place. If we allow ourselves to become angry, frightened or impatient, we lose that connection and realization. That other person who has made the mistake of indulging in selfishness or deceit or some other divisive motive or attitude, has lost something of untold value thereby. Our job is twofold, —not to let the event cause us the same loss, and to try immediately to help him to recover or find that treasure which he has lost or perhaps never has had at all.

Impatience is a form of fear. We must learn to be efficient and to stimulate others to be efficient and conserving of time, without overvaluing time or ever becoming impatient. In case one's purpose is blocked, either switch all one's thought and energy immediately to devise a plan for getting around the obstacle, and if possible persuading its energy to aid our new direction of energy; or else, if it is a blockade which cannot be remedied, turn to an entirely different task or try to contemplate the event in the largest possible aspects and integrations of life.

In a case where some hard truth must be told, and yet the telling of it, if not very tactfully done, would be sure to arouse anger or fear or ill-will, it is useful to realize why harshness or rudeness is wrong. The real reason seems to be that a truth told in a harsh or inconsiderate way becomes only a half-truth. That manner of telling it makes the situation inconsistent with the greatest and most inclusive truth, namely, that we are all contained in a spiritual unity which we apprehend and express by love. A truth told in an unloving way thus becomes a partial falsehood.

It will be necessary to train children

so that they may as little as possible feel fear and anger in various phases and intensities. In their earliest years this training is largely a matter of unconscious imitation of conscious or unconscious attitudes, actions, tones of voice or looks of one or both parents or other older persons close to the children. Teachers and parents must, therefore, begin with themselves. Older children can be much helped by formal or playful stimulus and training in manipulative activities of all kinds. Rivers states that there seems to be total absence of fear while a person is meeting a danger by a carefully developed and effective and skilfully used form of manipulative activity¹. Bertrand Russell, in his book on education, suggests that there are many sports which tend to develop a courageous attitude of meeting dangers by skilled manipulations, as mountaineering, riding a horse, bicycle or motor car, managing a boat, running and dodging in games, climbing trees, using ropes, Boy Scout work, etc. Much fear can thus be transformed into scientific interest. Teaching the meaning and operation of fear and anger will be a vast help. And if manipulative activity is also made to include the methods of non-viol-

1. Rivers—*Instinct and the Unconscious*, pp. 57, 241-2.

ent resistance and goodwill, the child can be trained to meet all the situations of life courageously and creatively. A certain amount of both conscious and sub-conscious thinking can be stimulated in the child by suitable stories of courageous non-violent resistance ¹.

For all of us, old and young, there is much work to be done in unlearning our old mistaken and trouble-producing concepts, attitudes and habits, and a learning and training of them anew in nearer consonance with truth. It will involve a re-education of our emotions, a re-conditioning of our reflexes, and a re-statement of our assumptions and beliefs. ² To establish these new habits will require a period of self-discipline. It will not be easy. There will be failures. Persistence is of very great value. ³

The possible occasions and situations of annoyance, anger or threatened loss

1. Cf. *Hindu Mind Training*, by an Anglo-Saxon Mother—Longmans Green, 1917, introduction by S. M. Mitra.

2. For excellent suggestions see W. M. Marston—*Emotions of Normal People*; I. P. Pavlov—*Conditioned Reflexes*; E. B. Holt—*The Freudian Wish*, all previously cited; *Recent Advances in Physiology* by C. L. Evans, Blakiston, Philadelphia, 1928; T. Burrows—*The Social Basis of Consciousness*, previously cited.

3. Cf. William James essay on *Habit*.

which can and must be utilized for self-training are infinite. Someone is stupid or forgets to do something, or violates a promise, or fails to return a borrowed article. Perhaps there is delay or difficulty in buying a rail road ticket, or some one else's cart or motor car collides with that in which one is driving, or there is a traffic jam when we are in a great hurry. Perhaps the telephone operator gives one the wrong number, or the food gets burned or the meal delayed. A child teases or is naughty or disobedient. Business goes wrong. There are financial losses. The crop is injured. Someone makes a slighting, scornful or contemptuous remark about oneself or about a person whom one holds dear. Some one violates a trust, or their purpose and action interferes with or frustrates our own, and so on.

One way to avoid or reduce the anger or irritation which such events usually arouse in us when they are not mere impersonal chance, is to consider the other person's acts, ideas or attitude as mistakes (taking care to remember that oneself is also often mistaken). Even things which are deliberate and intentional are mistakes. Greed is a mistake; so are selfishness and cruelty. If they are

so regarded, it is easier to bear them, just as one child puts up with the mistakes of others in their school lessons, even though such mistakes often hold back the entire class or result in their all being punished. Others suffer for our mistakes, and we must suffer for theirs. This needs patience, kindness, endless repetition, trying to understand how the other person's mind works and what his assumptions and fears are, never giving up hope.

Again, we all need to exercise tolerance in allowing other persons to choose their own way or means or symbol of expressing their sense of human unity. A wealthy person may seem very stingy to us and yet, for example, be expressing his vision of unity or beauty or perfection by gathering a collection of paintings which he plans to give to a public museum at his death. Or, he may be paying for a scientific expedition to the South Seas, or for beds in a hospital. The fact that he is wholly unresponsive to appeals for another kind of good work, or even that he exploits people with one hand while he gives away with the other is no ground for harsh personal criticism of him. The employees of his company may find it necessary to go on strike in order to educate him to a wider

and clearer sense of human unity, and in order to maintain their own self-respect and freedom and life, but there need be no more ill-will about it than where boys are teaching a new, ignorant boy how to play football, as a necessary part of school life.

The non-violent resister will have many problems as to what institutions or customs he will co-operate with and what not, or to what extent his co-operation will go. As he carries on, his vision will grow clearer. Certain activities will come to seem less important; others will become more important. Some, which at first he approved, will come to seem mistaken or even wholly wrong. When they come to seem wholly inconsistent with the truth as he sees it, he will dissociate himself from them. We may treat such changes as Fox did William Penn's question whether he should continue to wear a sword:—"Wear it as long as thou canst." ¹

1. Much help to one's thinking on these matters can be found in the writings of M. K. Gandhi (published by S. Ganesan and Natesan & Co., Madras, and by Navajivan Press, Ahmedabad, India), in Thoreau's *Life Without Principle* and *The Virtue of Civil Disobedience*; in Ruskin's *Unto this Last* and *The Crown of Wild Olive*, in Kipling's poem *If*; in the books cited in the footnotes of this book. See also the excellent bibliography of books on war and

Some who are sensitive may well hesitate to take a position before the public which will make them seem conspicuous, different from their friends, or "queer." In regard to non-essentials that is indeed wise, and it is for each person to decide for himself what is or is not essential or important. In making this decision, however, it will be wise to remember that it is of very great importance to have one's outer acts correspond with one's inner spiritual attitude. And in situations where mutual understanding is needed, it is also often important to make the outer action or symbol of such a nature that it will be understood by the other party. Again, the value of social courage is to be duly considered and balanced with the importance of avoiding display or notoriety.

A good example of this has occurred in India where Mr. Gandhi has been censured by some for wearing only very scanty clothes made of coarse homespun cotton. His critics accuse him of praising humility and obscurity and yet displaying these striking outward marks of his economic and social ideas. They say he makes a sect of it and thus separates

himself from the kind of people among whom he was born.

This no doubt has its element of truth, but there is another aspect of the matter to be considered. Buddha, Kabir and Christ did not attack existing institutions or attempt any economic reforms, but nevertheless they took care to live in the humblest and simplest possible way and spent most of their time among "the poorest and the lowliest and the lost," to use Tagore's beautiful phrase. And as Buddha was a prince by birth, no doubt his actions seemed "queer" and extravagant to his former associates. Mr. Gandhi is, if I understand aright, trying to express by an outward act which will be understandable to the most ignorant peasant, that he believes in the unity of the whole human family, that furthermore a unification between the upper and lower classes is necessary for the political as well as social salvation of India, that he has compassion, that he will not separate himself from the great majority by enjoying comforts which are denied to them. He hopes, probably, that the intelligence and superior articulateness and facilities for intercourse of the "intelligencia" will not permit his acts to raise a barrier between himself and

them. By his further work of encouraging home spinning and weaving he is striving further to express that sense of unity by stimulating the poor to raise themselves out of their degradation by their own efforts and inner strength.

Some of his critics do not believe that this is the way to help the peasants, nor is that the sort of gesture by which they can best express their own inner character or sense of the spiritual unity of mankind. But to those who know Mr. Gandhi personally, it does not seem difficult to believe in his sincerity. So long as each one of us strives to express his own vision of truth, with as much fidelity and strength as is in him, may we not let others do their way without irritation on our part? Each in his own way and according to his own light must avoid on the one hand externalism and its tendency toward Puritanism and Dualism, and on the other hand too much turning inward with its tendency to conservative action, dependence and waste. Life needs to be lived as a whole, with courageous and faithful external expression and fulfilment of inner truth, with a fine balance and harmony between the inner and outer life.

Inasmuch as some non-violent resist-

ers will sooner or later find themselves in jail, it would be advisable to imagine as many situations there as possible and what one should do in accordance with principles of non-violent resistance. There will be such difficulties as rough arrests, "third degree", prison discipline, various insults, humiliations and intimidations. Mr. Gandhi's instructions to his followers are interesting in this connection; also the conduct of conscientious objectors in English and American prisons during the war.¹

Economic injustice, industrial, commercial and political exploitation must be ended as a part of the realization of the spiritual unity and equality of mankind and its outward expression. There is so much mistakenness of thought, attitude, habit and institution that this spiritual equality must be asserted strongly and with energy, although without violence. Mere words or pleas are not enough. They are only a part of our total language. They probably must be supplemented in many instances by strikes and economic

1. See *Young India* 1919-1922—S. Ganesan, Madras and B. W. Huebsch, New York, in index under *Jails*. Also the books by J. W. Graham and Norman Thomas on C. O. S. in England and America, previously cited, and *Fighting for Peace*, by W. J. Chamberlain,—No More War Movement, London.

boycotts. If done in the right way these help to create and strengthen the desired realizations, both among the employers and employees, among the exploiters and those who are exploited. By non-violent voluntary suffering with love we can find new realms of social, economic and political truth. The real reason for my going on strike to stop the exploitation of myself and my fellow workers is not because the exploitation is making us suffer, but because the fears which it tends to induce in me and in them threaten our awareness and connection of the most valuable element of our existence. The corresponding inconsiderateness, selfishness, narrowness, and greed induced at the same time in the employers, owners or stockholders similarly robs them of the same treasure. We strike for the benefit of everyone, but to carry out our end it is essential that there be no violence of act or motive on our part. Since the human family is one, and fine equality of intercourse is essential to a fine civilization, the workers have a duty to help the employer from becoming too blinded by the economic system of which they are a part.

In companionships and modes of living there are great advantages in being

among the poor and simple, not because of their poverty or lacks, but because the simplicity which poverty compels conduces to clearness of vision. Then one is not so cluttered with things and "thinginess" or with ideas of power, nor is one's time so filled with trivialities. Also, since most of the people of the world are poor, to live with the poor helps, by quantitative suggestion, to keep us steadily aware of human unity. Also it greatly simplifies choices and all of life, and thereby reduces nervous strain.

We can avoid much heated feeling if we once thoroughly realize how much of our life is dealing with abstractions, symbols, labels and tags and how seldom does a particular noun or adjective have exactly the same connotation or meaning to any two individuals, much less to two groups of peoples¹. Careful definition would tend to reduce many disputes which are now not about realities but about symbols and tags.

Much bother would also be saved by whole-heartedly adopting the policy of

1. Cf. C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*—Kegan Paul, London and Harcourt Brace, New York, 1927. I. A. Richards—*Principles of Literary Criticism*, Ibid, 1926; A. Korzybski, *Time Binding—The General Theory*—Papers One and Two, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1924, and Jas. Wood, Washington, D. C. 1926.

concentrating as much as possible of one's attention, energy, thought, and time upon creative, constructive good and letting the evil, so far as possible, die from lack of attention, from being ignored, or from being crowded out by good.

Yet if the person of creative kindness finds his efforts snubbed or repulsed, treated with contempt or exploited, returned with injury or ill-will, he may not allow himself to become resentful or self-pitying. That is a test of his persistence, his sincerity, his faith, his will, his love, his imagination and skill. Let him create victory by his strength and the creative power of his method.¹ It is a modern application of Christ's parable about the necessity for seeking the Kingdom of God *importunately*.²

As previously stated in Chapter VI, non-violent resistance is in part a proposal to control anger as completely and thoroughly as militarism has controlled fear. The non-violent resister must work out the details of this discipline and never cease its application.

1. See Marston, *Emotions of Normal People*—pp 152-154 on the psychological value of persistence and tenacity, on the principle of prolongation, repetition and summation of stimuli.

2. Luke II: 5-10.

During this application and his thinking and his experimenting, he will sooner or later need to define the meaning of the word violence. While I could not frame a sure and conclusive definition of the term, I offer the following as a tentative working formula or basis of discussion:—Violence is any act, motive, active feeling, or outwardly directed attitude which is divisive in nature or result in respect to emotions or inner attitude; that is to say, inconsistent with spiritual unity. This would include intellectual and moral violence as well as physical. It would include, for example, pride, scorn, contempt, anger, impatience, grumbling, spite, indignation, as well as killing, wounding, frightening, exploiting, cheating, deceiving, poisoning, tempting to evil, flattering deliberate weakening of character and similar wrong.

In addition to the things which the non-violent resister will need to do, there are many things which he will want to avoid doing, because they are morally and spiritually and often logically inconsistent with his main purpose and concept. Such inconsistencies as these have been in the past one of the chief reasons for the impotence of pacifism in the West. Also probably for the breakdown of inter-

national socialism at the beginning of the World War. The inconsistencies have often been wholly unconscious, but they have been no less real and weakening on that account.

Let us merely name a few of these for the reader to work out for himself. They would, we believe, include the following: capitalism and purely monetary valuations, the modern Western emphasis on individualism,¹ race pride,² class pride, intellectual pride, nationalism or political patriotism,³ *hatred* of injustice or wrong, "righteous indignation," priggishness, complacency, parents punishing children for lying although they deceive the children either directly or by implication themselves, governments punishing men for murder but also punishing men severely if they do not murder upon order on certain occasions called wars, as if murder were a government monopoly. Perhaps suing in courts or calling upon the police for assistance are also to be included in the list. This list does not

1. Cf. T. Burrows—*Social Basis of Consciousness*, previously cited.

2. Cf. S. E. Stokes, *The Failure of European Civilization as a World Culture*, S. Ganesan, Madras, India.

3. Cf. Rabindranath Tagore—*Nationalism*—Macmillan; T. Veblen—*The Nature of Peace*—Macmillan, 1917.

pretend to be authoritative or complete, but merely food for thought.

The principles underlying all the foregoing suggestions are truth, love, spiritual unity and equality, gentleness, self-purification and voluntary self-suffering as a means of persuasion. Search for these principles everywhere in every person and event. Immerse yourself in these concepts. Let your imagination dwell upon them. Seek persons, books and environments which tend to strengthen them and illuminate their implications, applications and results. Try constantly to practise them so as to understand them better. With some such revision of your attitudes, assumptions and purposes, as we have tried to suggest, reconsider the art of loving your neighbors, your opponents and strangers.

The non-violent resister tries never to be dogmatic about his vision of the truth, and stands ready to test it by suffering all its consequences himself so far as he is able. He imposes his views on himself first and asks others to follow only when persuaded by the results. Thus non-violent resistance is a thoroughly responsible programme and it searchingly tests the sincerity of its users.

Growing out of the principle of love is the necessity for the non-violent resister to show great trust in the better nature of all people, even of his opponents, or of people who may have been deceitful. Trust in certain respects can be combined even with non-co-operation or non-violent resistance in other respects. Mr. Gandhi's life is a good example of this. But as Niebuhr so incisively points out in relation to America :—

"Love which expresses itself in trust without expressing itself in sacrifice is futile. It is not thorough going enough to be creative or redemptive."¹

The non-violent resister will be wise to ponder deeply the place of beauty in human relationships, the value of moral beauty, and morality as an art.² Also the importance of joy³ and humor. Through these qualities he will save himself from rigid austerity and puritanism, and retain freedom, his poise, sense of proportion, and loveliness.

In order to use non-violent resistance it is not necessary to have any book-learning. People do not require so called

1. Reinhold Niebuhr—*A Critique of Pacifism*—139 Atlantic Monthly, 637, May 1927.

2. Cf. Havelock Ellis—*The Dance of Life*—Chap. VI.

3. See writings of Rabindranath Tagore.

"education" or even literacy for its use. It is a weapon for the humble and poor and ignorant as well as for others. In this connection we find an interesting passage about Lenin, who was like Gandhi in being a very great leader of hundreds of millions of poor, ignorant and humble people. A. Rhys Williams in his biography of Lenin¹ writes thus of Lenin's estimate of the 'ignorant' masses :--

"Through the long years, in season and out of season, he insisted on their resoluteness, their tenacity, their capacity for sacrificing and suffering, their ability to grasp large political ideas, and the great creative and constructive forces latent within them . . . the heroism, and the economic, military and cultural potentialities of the proletarians."

Love, sincerity, honesty, humility, faith, courage, capacity for suffering, endurance, tenacity, determination, energy—these are common human traits. Herein lies the vastness and height and splendor and promise of non-violent resistance. It requires leaders who must be clear, keen, careful thinkers and who must know human nature profoundly. But the world always produces such leaders when the

1. A. Rhys Williams—*Lenin*—Scott and Seltzer, New York, 1919. See also writings of M. K. Gandhi previously cited, and Rene Fulop, Miller—*Lenin and Gandhi*—Putnams, New York and London, 1927.

times are ripe. It is our job, each in his own small sphere, to help ripen the time and prepare the way. We each can in some way work for the removal of fear.

When we come to consider group and national uses of non-violent resistance, we immediately face the necessity for training, discipline and organization. The self-development of them by individuals we have been considering above. The group aspects of them were considered at some length in chapters V, VI and VII. The discipline may not be imposed in harsh or tyrannical manner, but by kindly persuasion and force of example. And we must make allowance for occasional strategic "retreats" if the training proves on any occasion not to have been sufficient. Part of the training will have to be in the control and reduction of fear. We have already indicated some important methods to this end. Much can also be learned from books on military morale and discipline.¹

Good leadership is of course essential. Leaders can be trained by experi-

1. *e.g.*—*Psychology and the Soldier*—by F. C. Bartlett, Cambridge University Press, London, 1927; *The Psychology of Courage*—by H. G. Lord, Luce & Co. Boston, U. S. A. 1918; W. E. Hocking—*Morale and its Enemies*—Yale University Press, 1918.

ence, self-discipline and study, just as in every sort of organization. We are of course only in the crude beginnings of the organization of non-violent resistance and have much to try and to learn. Among the different groups in the world, those which are exploited most will be apt to be the leaders in the use of non-violent resistance. This means the Asiatic nations and African tribes, the negroes in America and labor organizations in all nations. Since the armies of the future are to be mechanical, labor organizations will bear an increasing responsibility for the maintenance of war. The militarists will be inclined to do their utmost to control the thinking and emotional attitudes and habits of the workers.

In order to wean men's minds, emotions and assumptions from the prevailing tradition of militarism and violence, it will be desirable to understand sentimentality and romanticism fairly clearly, for militarists are profoundly romantic and sentimental, although they dearly love to consider themselves the only realists in the world. Without attempting to write an essay on the subject we can perhaps gain some light by adopting Mr. Wyndham Lewis' definition of senti-

mentality¹ namely—"Any idea should be regarded as 'sentimental' that is not taken to its ultimate conclusion. I propose that as a working definition of 'sentimentality.'" If the militarists would only carry their idea through to its logical conclusion they would see that it means the extinction of the human species. Why then should we follow them any longer?

One important characteristic of romanticists is their love of using symbols and using them uncritically. They are enraptured by flags, insignia, uniforms, names of famous warriors, historical allusions to political and military prowess, salutes, ceremonial, pomp, display and the like. In part, this tendency is essential to civilization, for symbols are great stimulators and carriers of energy.² The energy of romanticists is excellent, but they make trouble often by using symbols which have become ambiguous or distorted from their original meaning or wholly false to modern realities. When an ambiguous or false

1. Essay entitled *Paleface*—p. 95. Chatto and Wyndus, London, 1929. See also Pierre Bonet—*The Fighting Instinct* (Trans.) Allen and Unwin, London, 1923, pp. 198 *et seq.*

2. See W. A. White—*Mechanism of Character Formation*—Macmillan, 1920.

symbol is used then the energy which it arouses is moved in the wrong direction and makes trouble. Symbols are excellent pieces of emotional and intellectual machinery, but they need periodic analysis and remodelling.

This brings us to consider the great importance of learning all we can about group thinking and the analysis of conflict and the re-integration of the elements of the conflict in order to find a solution. This was referred to in chapters III and IV. I would urge careful study of this by all group leaders.¹

Just as among individuals there are many attitudes and habits which are inconsistent with thorough-going non-violence, this is also true of our group, community and national life. Some inconsistencies are obvious, others are more subtle or hidden. We have no room to discuss them here.

1. See M. P. Folett—*The New State*—Longmans Green, New York, 1918; Ibid—*Creative Experience*—Ibid 1924; W. E. Hocking—*Man and the State*—pp. 315-317—Yale University Press, 1926; H. S. Elliott—*The Process of Group Thinking*—The Association Press, New York 1928; A. D. Sheffield—*Joining in Public Discussion*—, Doran, New York, 1922; Ibid—*Creative Discussion*—The Inquiry, New York, 1929; Ibid—*Training for Group Experience*—Ibid; E. C. Lindeman—*Community Conflict*, Ibid, 1929; E. B. Holt,—*The Freudian Wish*—previously cited.

The solar energy concept described in Chapter IX may be found very useful in working out some of the following problems:—how to reach a basis for unifying rural and city workers, to end the idea that rural life is dull, to create sound land and tax laws, to create sounder economic and political relationships between temperate and tropical zones, to create a sounder ideological and financial balance between industry and agriculture, to evolve an assurance of economic security to every nation, to help evolve a vision of the interest, activity, happiness, creativeness and other positive values of peace.

Economic boycott or non-co-operation will be one of the weapons of mass non-violent resistance. It offers room for much experiment and work.

Care must be taken lest a given struggle or resistance should become violent or coercive in spirit although retaining an outward form or manner of non-violence. This has occurred in some student strikes in India. It is perhaps even more likely to occur in cases of individual non-violent resistance. The interested reader will do well to consult Mr. Gandhi's writings in regard to this.¹

1. See *Young India*—1919-1922—Ganesan, Madras.

Those who seek practical information as to the conduct of non-violent resistance by exploited races or nations are referred to Chapter VII and the citations there. Some political and economic problems and lines of attack upon them have also been suggested in earlier chapters.

Although very likely I am mistaken, the League of Nations, as an instrument for real peace, seems to me to be born ahead of its time. No doubt it performs political and informative functions that are useful to certain nations and certain groups, but that is a different matter. Much spade work is required before there can be a true league of nations for true peace. At present there is not the recognition of spiritual equality present to afford a basis for such a condition. Once the necessary spade work and psychological preparation has been done it would be very easy to prevent war through various organizations such as labor unions, churches, etc. The mere increased understanding by many people about the processes and causes of war and about the psychology of anger, fear and other

and Huebsch, New York, 1923; *Young India* 1924-26, Ganesan, Madras; *My Experiments with Truth* by M. K. Gandhi; and *Satyagraha in South Africa* by M. K. Gandhi, previously cited.

divisive emotions will help very greatly to prevent war.

There is a necessity for more interesting, more positive, more heroic and more beautiful concepts of peace. They must be the work of many minds and hearts. Even the hastiest consideration of a non-violent nation would indicate that it would excel those of the present day in respect to health, freedom, creativeness, art, music, beauty, distribution and total amount of real consumable wealth, self-respect, respect from others, leisure and happiness. Perhaps we could not expect these new visions to be very definite or concrete until we could evolve an instrument for cutting out the paths of peace. I believe that the non-violent resistance provides this tool. If so, I hope that a considerable number may grasp it and begin experiments with humility, carefulness and energy.

This book is only an elementary statement of the values and possibilities of non-violent resistance. Some day we will learn to see more clearly and fully. Much more than there is in this book can, of course, be learned from the words and lives of the great leaders and practisers of this idea. Yet many of such truths need re-statement in modern

phraseology in order to be clearly understood.

Men have become so disillusioned by ages of violence and war that exceedingly few of them now really believe that the Kingdom of God can actually be created here on earth. But I believe that this is an ideal which can be realized. This book is an attempt to describe the practical instrument by which we can make very great progress towards that goal.

FINIS

